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The researcher examined a relatively unexplored and limited territory dealing with higher education organizational pluralism pertaining to particalized substance abuse programs in private sectarian institutions of higher learning with student populations of under five thousand. The conceptual framework, which was a recapitulation of Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal's (1984) "multifaceted lens," applied to the human resource framework, the structural framework, the symbolic/cultural framework and the political framework in the administration of these selected substance abuse programs. The frames under which the respective substance abuse programs operate were identified by utilizing a semi-structured interview protocol.

The study found usage of management frames by substance abuse program administrators to be in agreement with Bolman and Deal's "four frames theory," with the preferred management style consistent across the frames. The
administrators of the substance abuse programs prefer the human resource frame almost categorically. Each institution places a strong emphasis on recruitment of an ideal type of student, modeled after a very clear and concise institutional mission statement. The pervasive theme of the mission message seeks potential Christian leaders only. Almost exclusively, the institutions studied do not tolerate substances of any sort.

The administrators interviewed were knowledgeable about the various organizational frames and expressed concerns regarding the symbolic/cultural framework. With the exception of one institution, administrators of programs believe that the Christian ethic practiced throughout their institutions is the most significant factor preventing their institutions from utilizing the political frame during times of dwindling economic resources, thus remaining congruent with the institutional mission. The institutions studied were not complex in management structure and provide relatively unambiguous environments. The students and personnel have free access to administrators of substance abuse programs, who utilize prayer and the Christian ethic as important tools in intervention.

This qualitative approach captured the essence of the organizational dimensions of these substance abuse programs in the selected private sectarian institutions of higher studies in Texas.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Substance abuse has become part of the living style of vast numbers of residents of the United States of America (Ponder, 1987; Ray & Ksir, 1987; United States Department of Health and Human Services [USDHHS], 1990). As suggested by numerous authorities, over time as the society has changed, the choice of drugs has changed as well. According to the Task Force on Alcohol and Other Drugs [Task Force], (1988), as well as other credible sources, substance abuse affects educational systems at all levels, and institutions of higher education are affected, as well, at all levels, from administration to faculty, including staff, students, parents, alumni, and the population at large. It is not difficult to understand why, since according to these same authorities, one out of four persons in the United States has been adversely affected by substance abuse.

Money alone is not the solution to the substance abuse problem in the United States. Excessive amounts of money have been expended in the attempt to eliminate the drug problem, to little effect. In 1990 alone, according to the federal government, more than $136,000,000,000 was spent on the substance abuse problem, and with no permanent solution in sight (USDHHS, [preprint], 1990). School systems provide
the best hope of educating the public, since administrators and educators have the opportunity to reach thousands of young people to tell them of the consequences of substance abuse; however, institutions need to evaluate their own policies to ensure that they are not sending unclear signals regarding substance abuse policies (What Works: School without Drugs [What Works], 1989). There are already sufficient laws that regulate the use of, or prohibit substances; however, when the institutions of higher learning write policies, these policies need to be enforced uniformly. For example, students may become confused about alcohol-prevention policies if beer is for sale in the Student Union or if cigarette vending machines are available on a university campus, where no one is allowed to smoke in any of the buildings. According to numerous federal reports, failure to make a clear statement may exacerbate the dilemma facing the nation’s public and private institutions of higher education (Task Force, 1988; What Works, 1989; Policy Statement, 1990).

The problem of substance abuse has been of major concern to the nation since the 1960s, but it was not addressed by the higher education community until the 1980s. The well-being of students is the responsibility of the institution as a whole, not merely the responsibility of the counseling staff or of the student health center (What Works, 1989). Lack of coordination can adversely affect
substance abuse programs; the placement and reporting chain within a particular educational institution can add to or detract from the effectiveness of programs (Policy statement, 1990).

According to Bolman and Deal (1984) and others, whether the institution is small or large, the administrators of organizations designed to deal with any specific problem must beware of developing an overly narrow perspective (Birnbaum, 1989; Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Rice, 1991). Administrators need to be aware constantly of the whole mission of the entire organization and should ensure that the functioning of the individual units works toward the common goals of the institution itself (Birnbaum, 1989); therefore, when considering organizational administration of substance abuse programs it is deemed advisable to do so in relation to their parent institutions.

Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal (1984), as well as Estela M. Bensimon, Anna Neumann, & Robert Birnbaum, (1989) and others, have suggested that an analysis of the organizational dimensions of various units within institutions of higher education could be helpful to the institution as a whole. It is further suggested by Bolman and Deal (1984), Robert Birnbaum (1989), and Daniel Rice (1991) that when the administrators understand the organization, the organization becomes more effective. The implication of such understanding for more effective
management of substance abuse programs could be important, as all major social units in the focus of this study was to determine the dimensions of units concerned with substance abuse programs within private sectarian institutions of higher education.

Both Bolman and Deal (1984), and Rice (1991) believe that administrators do not have to employ a variety of consultants to have the complete picture of their organization. They suggest the utilization of varied perspectives to acquire a more complete understanding of the institution and a more encompassing selection for administrative action.

In order to achieve the more comprehensive view needed, especially in higher education administration, Bolman and Deal (1984) synthesized the thinking of the major schools of organizational research and theory into four specific frames of organizational administration, noting that the structural frame relies on the importance of structured participatory roles; the human resource frame sets the boundaries inhabited by the units personnel; the organizations political frame establishes the power structures common in today's world of dwindling resources; and the symbolic/cultural frame assists in the identification of the organization's culture. This theoretical framework allows administrators to view the organization as a continuous process (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). Moreover,
continuing research utilizing the four frames has demonstrated the utility of the Bolman and Deal conceptual point of reference in enhancing the analysis and understanding of the problems of organizational dynamics (Rice, 1991).

Overview

This study examined a relatively unexplored and limited territory dealing with higher education organizational theory, that of substance abuse programs in private sectarian institutions. According to William A. Kaplin (1985), private institutions are typically chartered as nonprofit corporations, are subject primarily to the laws of contract, and have a private administrative board. Private institutions are not normally funded by the state legislature, or some other instrument of government. Kaplin also states that public institutions are funded by the state legislature, or some other instrument of government; they have to conform to the strictures of the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; and they have to conform to a great range of public laws; they are required to conduct open meetings and maintain open records. Private institutions operate under an entirely different and less restrictive set of rules.

While public institutions of higher education are instruments of the state and can be regulated as such, private institutions, so long as they do not accept federal
monies, are allowed to operate as they see fit to a greater
degree than public institutions (Kaplin, 1985). Kaplin
(1985) argued that there is a long tradition supporting such
freedom and, more importantly, a great quantity of
legislation and case law which maintains this tradition.
Thus, private institutions have fewer external influences
that affect the administration of these institutions, as
well as their substance abuse programs. For this reason,
these private sectarian institutions of higher education
provided what was considered virgin territory for the
application of Bolman and Deal's organization theory.

To date there had been very little research into the
nature of substance abuse programs in operation at private
institutions of higher education. According to Sara
Lawrence Lightfoot (1983), such studies were needed so that
the essence of such programs could be captured in the
process of developing a basis of understanding of how they
work.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study was the
organizational dimension of substance abuse programs in
selected private sectarian institutions of higher learning
in Texas.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the
organizational dimensions of substance abuse programs (by
applying the Bolman and Deal multifaceted lens to the administration of these programs to identify the frames through which they operate. While the multifaceted "lens" has been used successfully in higher education before 1989, (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Birnbaum, 1989; Bensimon et al., 1989; Rice, 1991), an exhaustive literature search revealed no application of this particular method to management (administration) of substance abuse programs in private sectarian institutions of higher education. This approach is an excellent tool for examining the management of all aspects of higher education (Bensimon et al., 1989; Rice, 1991), but especially student service areas. According to Bolman and Deal (1984) the understanding of a problem from a variety of perspectives (dimensions) can help the organization to achieve greater freedom of operation and better understanding of methods (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Birnbaum, 1989; Bensimon et al., 1989; Rice, 1991).

Research Question

In relation to the purposes of the study the following research questions were posed.

1. What is the organizational framework [dimension] through which each of the respective substance abuse program operates? [i.e., the political, structural, human resource, and the symbolic/cultural frames].
2. Which of the above listed frames is utilized [predominately]?

3. How is the organization [of the substance abuse programs or the unit in which it operates] visualized by its members [ie., from the viewpoint of the administrator]?

4. Has reorganization been contemplated? [ie., reorganization of the substance abuse program or the unit in which it operates]

Parameters of the Study

The study examined (the organizational dimensions of the) substance abuse programs in effect at selected institutions of higher education. The institutions selected were limited to private sectarian institutions of higher education in Texas.
Organizational Theory as Interpretive Lens

Organizational theory, as defined by Richard L. Daft (1989), is considered to be a tool for analysis of and understanding organizations. It explains how the variables or characteristics of the organization are causally related while taking into consideration the complete sociological aspects of the organizational unit (Schmuck, 1972; Schein, 1985; Guthrie & Reed, 1986; Bensimon et al., 1989; Daft, 1989; Rice, 1991). As several authors suggest, that organization theory may facilitate comprehension of how the organization operates in its entirety and allow the administrator a way of analyzing, administering or managing the organization for successful and effective utilization of all resources (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Birnbaum, 1989; Bensimon et al., 1989; Rice, 1991). The term "organizational model" describes, for educational administrators in particular, the important dimensions of the organization and assists an individual in thinking about that aspect of the organization. According to James W. Guthrie and Rodney J. Reed (1986) and others, for educational administrators in particular; however, organizational theory has really been applicable only since the early 1970s when serious efforts
to apply it in a unified and comprehensive system were initiated (Schein, 1985).

In 1984, the first comprehensive theory that was tailored for higher education application was given birth by Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal. According to several authors, the difficulty that had confronted professional educators until that time was that none of the organizational theories or models previously developed encompassed the entire range of the higher education system (Schein, 1985; Bensimon et al., 1989; Rice, 1991). The four frames theory developed by Bolman and Deal, however, provides sufficient flexibility to be used by the administration at all levels in institutions of higher education (Bensimon et al., 1989). The four frames theory provides an analytical tool that can be readily applied within the qualitative research paradigm.

Bolman and Deal did not reinvent the wheel. They applied terminology to cover all aspects of organizational theory. For example, they borrowed from Owen (1991), and others who addressed the theory of organizational development; they borrowed from Maslow and his contemporaries who addressed human resources and the motivational needs of man (Maslow, 1970). They developed Mitzberg's ideas about organizational structures (Mitzberg, 1979). They borrowed from other theorists such as Oudchi (1982), and addressed the cultural needs of organizations (Kuh & Witt, 1988) as well as the importance of the
political aspects of any organization in this time of dwindling resources. None of these theories alone had previously been broad enough adequately to describe higher education organizations, particularly in the 1980s and 1990s, when the advance of technology has brought about such rapid change as to cause the extinction of the "static" organization (Bensimon et al., 1989; Rice, 1991). With the addition of constraints caused by dwindling economic resources, Bolman and Deal's, four frames theories are an applicable all-encompassing method that can be used to comprehend the complete system of a substance abuse program in a comprehensive institution of higher education (Rice, 1991).

Bolman and Deal's four frames theories are extremely relevant to all higher education organizations (Birnbaum, 1989). As Bolman and Deal postulate, if an administrator understands the organization, then he or she will be a more effective administrator.

Bolman and Deal (1984) have also developed a comprehensive theory that they maintain allows for administrators of any organization to understand the smaller units of that organization in the context of the larger organization; organizational pluralism. They maintain that administrators must understand at the beginning where the specific unit fits into the frame of the larger organization. The administrator must be able to "view" his
group's relative position in the larger organization from a variety of vantage points" (Bolman & Deal, 1984).

Moreover, Bolman and Deal have synthesized the thinking of the major organizational research theorists into four comprehensive frames.

This is extremely significant because this is the only comprehensive theory especially designed for analyzing organizations within higher education (Rice, 1991). The only other theory that approaches this comprehensive theory is the open systems theory; however, it is not truly complete for the application to higher education organizations.

The three most significant tests that need to be applied for applicability to higher education are the tests of: parsimony, generality, and fertility (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Bensimon et al. 1989; Rice, 1991). The open systems theory "passes" the first two tests; however, this theory is incapable of generating interesting and testable prediction, the fruit of the four frames theory (Owen, 1991).

The four frames are grouped into four specific areas:

1. Structural
2. Political
3. Human Resource and
4. Symbolic.

The structural frame emphasizes the importance of formal roles and relationships (Bensimon et al., 1989; Rice,
The political frame views organizations as arenas of scarce resources where power and influence are constantly affecting allocation of resources among individuals and groups (Bolman & Deal, 1984). The human resource frame establishes its territory because organizations are inhabited by people (Bensimon, et al. 1989) and the symbolic/cultural frame abandons the assumptions of rationality that appear in the other frames (Deal & Kennedy, 1990).

Conclusion

According to Bolman and Deal (1984), applying a variety of perspectives (frames or lenses) can help the organization achieve more leeway for innovation. They also advocate examining the administration from the vantage points of the organization. The study determined the perspectives or frames (organizational dimensions) through which the substance abuse programs in selected private sectarian institutions of higher education in Texas were managed (administered).

History of the Substance Problem

Substance abuse is a centuries-old, universal problem. The historical perspective provided below illustrates the development of the substance abuse problem from ancient to modern times. It illustrates the resulting catastrophic
devastation as well as the monetary costs associated with the problem.

According to John Gagliano (1960), dates back to the sixth century: a myth from Peru "It seemed there was a beautiful woman executed for adultery, cut in half, and buried. From one part of her remains the coca plant grew and blossomed to be consumed, only by men, in memory of her." The myth illustrates that substance abuse is not an isolated problem but might instead be termed an ill common to mankind throughout history. During the period of Great Exploration, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, many new drugs, considered to be treasures of indulgence, were imported to Europe, only to become sources of subsequent addiction for many Europeans. Several of the acquired treasures were coffee, seeds from the cacao tree, tea, coca leaves, kola nuts, and tobacco. Within a short time the Europeans who used the imports became habituated to their derivatives, namely caffeine, cocaine (cocaine is derived from the Erythroxylon coca shrub), and nicotine. As a result of the active use of drugs during that period, it was natural to anticipate a problem for the settlers in the newly acquired lands (Gagliano, 1960).

Later, in the New World, attention focused in the north on alcohol consumption. According to various writers such as H. G. Levine (1978), at the time the U.S. Constitution was being drafted, drinking and drunkenness were all too
common. Most colonials believed that daily drinking was necessary for good health. Employers provided their employees with rum, which was consumed during the work day. Both George Washington and Thomas Jefferson expressed concern about drunkenness and the consumption of distilled spirits, and each at one time advocated a switch to other beverages (wine and beer) (Bailey & Kennedy, 1987) to reduce the level of drunkenness.

By 1838, Superintendent Woodward of the asylum at Worcester, Massachusetts, described the chronic alcohol user as suffering from a physical disease (Levine, 1978). By the middle of the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, problems with chronic opiate use and tobacco use also came to be viewed (especially by those in the Temperance Movement) as in some ways analogous to drunkenness, simultaneously representing moral weakness and disease. The early Temperance Movement adopted the position that since the use of any drug eventually led to addiction, akin to spiritual enslavement, the only acceptable moral behavior was to avoid the drugs entirely (DuPont, Goldstein, & O’Donnell, 1979).

As early as the late 1800s, the United States had tried to deal with the substance abuse problem by enacting legislation after realizing the individual states were unable to control the situation within their own boundaries (Dogoloff, 1980). Prior to 1960, the total treatment capacity for substance abuse in the United States consisted
of a mere handful of outpatient clinics. Within the last 30 years a unique categorical drug abuse treatment network has been developed. During these years it has been learned that drug abuse is not a solitary tragedy. Treatment includes the abuser and the abuser's family (to be understood in extended terms, e.g., family, peer group, any primary relationship). Without this primary relationship the totality of the individual cannot be understood and changes or real success in overcoming the problem will be limited. (Please refer to the Substance Abuse Time Table in the Appendix I.)

Social and Economic Costs of Substance Abuse

In 1972, the level of federal categorical spending on substance abuse prevention reached $19 million. Until then funds on alcohol prevention never exceeded $3.6 million per year. The estimated costs--both social and economic--of substance abuse in the United States in 1979 were over $77.5 billion, of which $25 billion is attributed to the direct and indirect social costs related to tobacco smoking. Those costs do not include the billions of dollars in cash and goods that change hands in the purchase of all types of drugs. Nor do they include the range of intangibles that I cannot be priced but which represent the pain of mental and physical debilitation, the destruction of families, the disruption of neighborhoods, and other human suffering associated with substance abuse (Strategy Council on Drug
Abuse, 1979). According to the Surgeon General in the Seventh Special Report to the U.S. Congress on Alcohol and Health (USDHHS, 1990) over 26,000 deaths occurred as a direct result of liver disease caused by alcohol abuse. The economic cost related to alcoholism and alcohol abuse is expected to increase from the 1983 figure of $116.9 billion and the 1990 figure of $136.3 to a figure in excess of $150 billion before 1995 (USDHHS, 1990).

**FEDERAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAMS**

In 1978, the Veterans Administration and five Cabinet departments (Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, Defense, Labor, Justice, and Transportation) supported drug abuse treatment and prevention at a combined annual expenditure in excess of $380 million (Office of Drug Abuse Policy, 1978).

It appears, however, that there has been a reversal of funding trends in the past several years. Through Fiscal Year (FY) 1979, there had been annual incremental increases in spending on drug abuse programs. For FY 1980 and for each fiscal year thereafter, decreases in those areas.

There were significant In FY 1977, the National (NIDA) program budget was $259.8 Institute on Drug Abuse million. Its budget peaked in 1979 at $272.1 million and by FY 1981 was down to less than $235 million. The Department of Justice (DOJ) had annual incremental increases earmarked for drug abuse prevention starting with $168 million in FY 1977
to a figure in excess of $200 million in FY 1981. Most sectors under the Department of the Treasury showed the same pattern of increased funding. Their Drug Abuse Prevention budget for the Coast Guard increased from $9.7 million in FY 1971 to an overwhelming figure in excess of $100 million for FY 1981. One can conclude that the switch was made from treatment to prevention with the advent of the Reagan administration, yet it appears that a total comprehensive substance abuse program is needed in order to have an effective eradication of the substance abuse problem because there are not too many of us in this society that will or can escape direct contact with the problems created by substance abuse. By conservative estimates, over 100 million Americans indulge in some form of alcohol—which is a legalized drug. The NIDA statistics for 1980 revealed that there were over 10 million people in the United States who were hard-core alcohol abusers. This figure held true in 1988 as well. The same story stated that of this figure, only 10 percent are receiving treatment. Americans over the age of fourteen consume approximately 2.5 gallons of alcohol annually. This is equivalent to 25 gallons of beer, 1.5 gallons of wine, or 2.4 gallons of distilled spirits. Over $20 billion is spent annually for alcoholic beverages, of which about 40 percent consists of tax revenues to federal, state, and municipal governments.
In 1967, the American Medical Association first designated alcoholism a disease. Alcoholism has more recently been classified as a handicap as well as a disease. It is common knowledge that people respond in different ways to different situations; that stands true for the alcoholic problem as well. The United States has taken a serious stand on the alcohol problem and has enacted much legislation to help combat the problem. Two of the most helpful laws were the passage of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1967 and the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcohol Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970.

On November 18, 1988, the U. S. Congress, as part of the omnibus drug legislation, enacted the Drug-Free Workplace Act (Public Law 100-690, Title V. Subtitle D). This law required that contractors and grantees of federal agencies certify that they will provide their employees, customers, patrons, and clients drug-free workplaces. Unfortunately, this law applies only to public institutions of higher education, not to private colleges or universities, unless they receive federal funds or their students receive federally guaranteed loans.
Definition of the Substance Abuse Problem

One of the most common drug problems and the one most difficult to treat is alcohol (substance) abuse. Many abusers will not even admit they have a problem. It is an extremely difficult illness to define. Symptomology, confusion, type, patterns, understanding, clinical acceptance, willful misconduct vs. disease, culture vs. heredity, responsibility, lay vs. professional -- all tend toward making treatment more difficult. Researchers have begun to agree that the behavior modification approach has failed to work. While alcoholism appears to be rather hopeless, many alcoholics who have given up or have been given up, make miraculous recoveries. The alcoholic ultimately must be willing to make the choice to quit drinking. There are no boundaries such as age, sex, culture, race, or socioeconomic status when it comes to addictive properties of drug abuse. Persons of any age, sex, ethnic, or racial grouping of the population are susceptible to drug using behavior (Anderson & Gadaleto, 1986).

According to A. Gadaleto and D. Anderson (1986) and others, there should be an enlightened awareness in higher education of the substance abuse problem. It is a sad situation in an area assumed to be in a level of developed intellect that this devastating problem has only of late been brought to the forefront (Magner, 1988).
Nearly thirty years has elapsed since in loco parentis was supplanted by the age of permissiveness. With the exit of in loco parentis institutions of higher learning retreated from the regulation of mores [issues extending from all-night visitations in residence halls, lax policies, "booze" in fraternities and residence halls, to no check-in hours for females]. During these years the pendulum had swung from extremely structured, disciplined rulings to an almost control-free environment. Since the campus setting is a microcosm of the society at large, where estimates of the substance abuse problem are in excess of 20 percent one can assume or imagine how pronounced the problem is in a largely uncontrolled environment such as the university setting. Ironically, the institution upon which society relies to conduct research for a plethora of issues has suffered a dearth of information on the substance abuse problem within its own populations.

Reason for "Benign Neglect" by Higher Education

One author (Ingalls, 1982) has accused higher education of "benign neglect" in the matter of the substance abuse problem on college and university campuses. Only since the late 1970s are colleges and universities beginning to deal with this problem through counseling, re-tightening of regulations, and education about substance abuse (Ponder, 1987; Anderson & Gadaleto, 1985). The consensus was that
however pervasive the substance abuse problem was, it was not on the increase (Ingalls, 1984). Moreover, the media and advertisers provided mixed messages about the dangers of substance abuse, as a consequence of which many Americans still do not identify nicotine as a drug; yet smoking is considered by Surgeon General C. "at risk behavior." Everett Koop to be another though nicotine was first isolated in 1828 (and studied irregularly ever since), Edison in 1914 labeled nicotine as a narcotic, a label confirmed by Mark Twain's admission: "it's easy to stop smoking--I've done it several times." Yet in 1981, Surgeon General Koop said that there is "no such thing as safe smoking or safe cigarettes." He indicated that cigarette smoking shortens life by seven years.

Since the early 1980s, the greatest governmental impact on the substance abuse problem facing higher education has come through the Fund to Improve Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) and, in 1986, the Drug Free America program. The latter put public colleges and universities on notice: have a substance abuse program in a year or have federal funding cut off. Counselors agree that approximately 80% of their student populations use a variety of chemical substances. Of that figure, 20% have moved from a significant abuse problem to dependence (Ponder, 1987; Kandel & Yamaguchi, 1985; Murray & Perry, 1985).
Moreover, increased numbers of suicides have been linked to substance abuse problems (Ray & Ksir, 1987), even though the total number of suicides in the United States has remained relatively stable during the past twenty years, the number of suicides each year still accounts for over ten persons out of every 100,000 who commit suicide in this country each year (Hipple & Cimbolic, 1979). One of the difficulties related to substance abuse and suicide, according to John L. Hipple and Lee B. Hipple (1983) is the question that is hard, if not impossible to answer; was it suicide or was it an accident? The present-day trend on college campuses is towards "total health," and rather than labeling it a substance abuse problem or addiction, now the helping agents recognize that usually there is a problem in other areas (Ray & Ksir, 1987).

The lack of a standard vocabulary and definitions among professionals in the field exacerbate the problem of educating the public (Duncan, 1990), and the problem of a standard vocabulary challenges us all. This is true not only in attempting to study organizations and their behavior, but also in trying to understand the dangers posed by substance abuse. For example, many counselors have identified the problem of substance abuse as being one of addictive behaviors. Such behaviors, however, run the gamut from the legal use of nicotine and alcohol all the way to the use of illegal substances such as cocaine and
marijuana. Many people do not even think of nicotine and alcohol as drugs (Satir, 1983). An ongoing stumbling block to researchers results from the lack of a standard terminology for the purposes of description among professionals in the field (Reppucci & Saunders, 1974). Standardization of terminology is central to this theme.

How can the professional researcher interpret the success rate when there is no standard definition of success? For instance, how does one interpret the available statistical data when each state's institutions of higher learning have no standard alcohol abuse records. Institutional studies consider drinking norms and alcohol problems differently. Despite all the problems listed there is a need for treatment. In conjunction with treatment, there is a great need for continuing assessment of ongoing programs (Ponder, 1987; Violette, 1986; Trice, 1966).

Conclusion

This study attempted to identify the organizations dimensions of substance abuse programs (by applying a variety of perspectives or frames), based on Bolman and Deal's four frames theory, to these substance abuse programs in the selected private sectarian institutions in Texas. The study attempted to determine the perspectives or frames (organizational dimensions) through which the substance abuse programs were managed (administered).
Selected Private Sectarian Institutions of Higher Education

As stated above, private institutions are typically chartered as non-profit corporations, are subject primarily to the laws of contract, and they have a private administrative board (Kaplin, 1985). Thus, they have more flexibility of organizational administration.

Private institutions which, so long as they do not accept federal monies, cannot be regulated to the same degree as public institutions (Kaplin, 1985). There is a long tradition and, more importantly, a great quantity of legislation and case law which maintain those traditions (Kaplan, 1985). Application of the Bolman and Deal frames to such institutions will assist in describing and explaining the organization and administration of substance abuse programs in private sectarian institutions of higher education.

Selected Institutions

Six private sectarian institutions of higher education were selected for this study. The institutions were selected in order to provide a selection (based upon a representative sample of religious affiliations to include Baptist, Christian, Church of Christ, Independent, non-denominational, Plymouth-Brethren, Roman Catholic, as well as Southern Baptist) of small private sectarian institutions that operate in Texas. These institutions were chosen;
moreover, because of their location within a major metropolitan area that has a high probability of substance abusers within the potential student population (Ponder, 1987; Violette, 1986; Kandel & Yamaguchi, 1985).

Criswell College is located at 4010 Gaston, Dallas Texas 75246. It is an independent Baptist, comprehensive, specialized coeducational college, founded in 1970. It has a regional accreditation, a student enrollment of less than 500 students and 27 faculty. Eighty-two percent of the full-time faculty have doctoral degrees. Criswell College is a total commuter campus. The Dean of Students, Dr. Kline stated that the school has a plan established for dealing with a substance abuse problem on campus.

Dallas Baptist University is located at 7777 West Kiest Boulevard, Dallas, Texas 75211. It is an independent Colleges and Schools -SACS). Southern Baptist comprehensive coeducational institution and is regionally accredited (with the Southern Association of Students are required to live on campus through the senior year if receiving financial aid or scholarship. The student population is less than 2500, and the institution offers a full range of undergraduate degrees. Dallas Baptist was founded in 1965. Dr. Robert Cotton, Director of Counseling stated that the school has a substance abuse program in place.

Dallas Christian College, Farmers Branch, Texas 75234, 2700 Christian Parkway, is an independent four-year college.
Dallas Christian is affiliated with Christian Churches as well as the Church of Christ. The primary accreditation is American Association of Bible Colleges (AABC). The undergraduate enrollment is less than 100 and is composed of 60% male and 40% female. All students are required to live on campus unless married. It was established that the college does not allow students to enter who have a known substance abuse problem; however, if the problem develops while the student is in school, there is a plan in place for dealing with the problem.

Dallas Theological Seminary is located at 3909 Swiss Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75204. Dallas Theological is an independent non-denominational graduate level institution founded in 1924. Dallas Theological is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). There are over 1200 male and female students enrolled on three campuses.

LeTourneau University, Dallas Campus is located at 5710 LBJ Freeway, Dallas, Texas 75240. LeTourneau is an independent, non-denominational institution, as well as having been affiliated with the Plymouth Brethren and is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, offering both undergraduate and graduate degrees and integrating Christian faith and learning. LeTourneau was founded in 1946. The Dallas campus was designed exclusively for the returning adult learner in order to
utilize his or her experience and maturity as a part of the learning process. LaTourneau University has a program for dealing with the problem of substance abuse. The University of Dallas is located at 1845 East Northgate Drive, Irving, Texas 75062-4799. The University has a student enrollment in excess of 3,000. It was founded in 1956 under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Dallas/Fort Worth and His Excellency Bishop Thomas K. Gorman. The faculty is primarily composed of Cistercian priests and sisters of the Order of St. Mary of Namur. It is an independent Roman Catholic coeducational university and is fully accredited with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, offering a full range of undergraduate and graduate degrees. There is an established substance abuse program and the interview will be conducted with the Assistant Dean of Students, Dr. Lisa L. Grubbs.

All institutions of higher education were purposefully selected under the category "private sectarian" and there will naturally be some limits to the range of possible organizational structures necessitated by the limitations of the category itself. Of the world's five major religions only the Christian religion (the Protestant and the Roman Catholic faiths) is represented among the religious schools of the State, as the selection reflects. The size of the organization may also affect the organizational structure, and the selected institutions range in size from under 100
to over 3,000 students to provide the potential for a broader scope of organizational structures. The type of or lack thereof, could also affect the organizational structure. The selected schools religious affiliation, represent Baptist (both Southern Baptist and Independent Baptist), Christian, Church of Christ, independent, non-denominational, and Roman Catholic.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Research Methodology

The target population of this study included six selected private sectarian institutions of higher education located in Texas. Analysis of the management (administration) of substance abuse programs was made by means of a semi-structured interview protocol. Each of the oral interviews conducted was with the respective program administrators or directors. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain data relevant to the organizational dimension (framework or perspective) of the substance abuse programs in operation at the respective institutions. The oral interviews were conducted after basic descriptive data regarding the nature of each institution’s substance abuse program were obtained. Questions were designed to assist in gathering data regarding the organization of specific programs, and special problems confronting individual institutions (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Harrison, 1987; Rice, 1991). The questions were open-ended in nature (Ives, 1984; Mitchell, 1985; Harrison, 1987; Siedman, 1991; Glesne, 1992). The director’s wishes pertaining to use of the recorded interview, according to the Donor Agreement, were strictly adhered to in order to comply with the canons of
oral interview research (Neuenschwander, 1985; Seidman, 1991).

As stated above, to date there had been very little research into the nature of substance abuse programs in operation at private institutions of higher education and according to Lightfoot (1983), and others, such studies were needed so that the essence of such programs would be captured in the process of developing a basis of understanding of how they worked. The substance abuse programs (organization dimensions) were clarified by taking a "snapshot" of their current operations that could be used as a point of departure for future quantitative research (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972; Lightfoot, McMahon, 1984; Barretta, 1983; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Duncan, 1990; Seidman, 1991).

There are manifold and immediate benefits to qualitative research. Among other things, qualitative research allows the researcher or research:

1. A better match or "fit" between the research questionnaire and respondent.
2. Greater opportunity to ask exploratory questions.
3. More informal and therefore more relaxed environment leads to more thoughtful responses.
4. Personal contact with the respondent may lead to an increased probability of getting a response. Other resources may be discovered inasmuch as the
interviewee at times serves as a "gatekeeper" and
knows others who have the same problems, and, more
importantly, how to contact them.

5. Oral interviews may lead to insights unobtainable
through the use of a traditional, impersonal
questionnaire.

6. Qualitative research is beneficial in the
generation of hypotheses for future use.
Moreover, the use of qualitative research allows
the researcher the opportunity to explore on the
spot, into the mind of the respondent.

7. There were five categories of questions [please see
Appendix II]:
   a. Demographic.
   b. Political.
   c. Structural.
   d. Human Resource.
   e. Symbolic/Cultural.
   f. Follow-up.

8. Qualitative research provides multiple sources of
data which yield useful results (Spradley &
McCurdy, 1972; Lightfoot, 1983; Miles & Huberman,
1984; McMahon, 1984; Barretta, 1987; Duncan, 1990;

The results from utilizing this method were just as
valid and frequently more reliable than data generated by
other means, which is in agreement with various researchers such as James P. Spradley and David W. McCurdy (1972), Edward D. Ives (1984), John Joseph McMahon (1984), Matthew B. Miles and A. Michael Huberman (1984), Brad A. Mitchell (1985), I. E. Seidman (1991); Corrine Glesner and Alan Peshin (1992). The interview protocol is an accepted procedure in the field of social science, as well as education (Ives, 1984; McMahon, 1984; Mitchell, 1985; Harrison, 1987; Rice, 1991; Seidman, 1991; Glesne, 1992). The use of oral interviewing techniques enabled the researcher to solicit information that would otherwise not be available through the use of a quantitative survey instrument (Ives, 1984; McMahon, 1984; Harrison, 1987; Seidman, 1991; Mitchell, 1985; Glesne, 1992).

The semi-structured interview protocol [please refer to Appendix II] was designed to elicit responses to answer the research questions. For example, questions were asked to determine whether the organization fits within the Symbolic/Cultural frame. The interviewer asked a variety of probing questions of the interviewee; the interviewee was asked, "How would the atmosphere at work be described to a friend?" The interviewer continued to explore for the interviewee's perception of the norms and beliefs and the nature of the work, how the work was performed and the level of employee involvement in the work. In the same vein, the interviewer asked how things had changed since the
organization got its start, whether and how things had changed in the organization's operations over time. Questions were also asked of each administrator interviewed to assist in identification purposes of the structural frame, to identify all programs under his or her direction, as well as to provide a description of the work performed in the unit. Each program under the auspices of each director (administrator) was included in the data display. This was done to provide a more complete and clear picture, and to assist in a better understanding of the comprehensive duties assigned to each director (administrator) interviewed.

Prior to the interviewing series, data were gathered on private sectarian institutions in Texas. This data collection included telephone canvassing of various institutions in Texas to see if they fit the parameters of private as well as sectarian. The search for the truly private sectarian institutions to be selected for this study were further delimited after it was determined during the canvassing procedure that a number of the institutions did not have a substance abuse program (formal or informal). From the data gathered it was determined that the institutions selected for the study provided a selection of truly private sectarian institutions of higher education for this study, as stated in Chapter II. The initial contact with the administrators of the substance abuse programs were made in order to arrange for permission to conduct the
original interviews and to set up an appointment to conduct the interviews.

The protocol used for this study was reviewed and verified by Dr. Ronald Marcello. [Please refer to Appendix II for a complete delineation of the questions.] The researcher conducted the interviews in person in the natural environment that was studied (Ives, 1984; McMahon, 1984; Mitchell, 1985; Harrison, 1987; Seidman, 1991; and Glesne, 1992). The interviewing series, consisted of over one hundred (100) probing, open-ended questions and included the original interviews conducted over approximately four (4) hours. Follow-up interviews were used to gather artifacts/documents and to facilitate extraction of follow-up data and ranged in time from two (2) to four (4) hours (Spradley and McCurdy, 1984; Mitchell, 1987; Harrison, Glesne, 1992; Schrag, 1992). The original oral interviews, recorded on audio tape, utilized a back-up audio tape recorder. The tapes were than transcribed at a later time, this allowed the researcher to focus more completely on what was stated by the interviewee (Harrison, 1987; Seidman, 1991; Glesne, 1992). The semi-structured interview protocol was grouped into three major categories: questions to elicit demographic data, including institutional characteristics and characteristics of the administrators; questions to elicit information about the current management frames being used by the administrators; and follow-up questions
regarding the components of the substance abuse programs, and the administrators' viewpoints regarding their units' strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Utilizing Bolman and Deal's (1984) four frames theory, frame questions were further grouped into four areas (as stated above): political, structural, human resource, and symbolic/cultural. The data gleaned in the study is presented in the order just described, beginning with the demographic data and can be found in Chapter IV. The order of presentation was by random selection.

A study of this type becomes more manageable, and the results become more useful because the researcher becomes more familiar with the environment in which the organization functions (Spradley and McCurdy, 1972; Ives, 1984; McMahon, 1984; Harrison, 1987; Seidman, 1991; Glesne, 1992). The researcher then more closely approaches the status of being a native to the culture or organization under study, at least the researcher had been there (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972; Ives, 1984; McMahon, Harrison, 1987; Mitchell, 1987). The researcher must become familiar with a multifaceted environment before it may begin to be quantified (Ives, 1984; McMahon, 1984; Rice, 1991; Seidman 1991). While conducting the interview, the researcher is also an observer. The interviews and observations were performed as objectively as possible, to develop meaningful statements about the organization (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972; Ives,
According to Seidman, once the data were gathered, assessment was more readily achieved and, probably made more accurately (Ives, 1984; McMahon, 1984; Mitchell, 1985; Harrison, 1987; Glesne, 1992). From the raw data meaningful statements about the substance abuse programs in private sectarian institutions of higher education were developed. With the collaboration between the interviewer and the interviewee from the outset in this type of inquiry, as the data were collected, important points of the subject's story became more clear (Spradley and McCurdy, 1972; Ives, 1984; Mitchell, 1991; Glesne, 1992; Seidman, 1992). From both the points of view of time and financial resources, qualitative research can be cost effective and in many cases is the only way to find out the desired data, (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Mitchell, 1987; Harrison, 1987; Glesne, 1992; Schrag, 1992) especially in consideration of the purposefully selected institutions of higher education studied. [Please refer to the Semi-Structured Interview Protocol in Appendix II.]

Considerable analyses of the data were made, utilizing the transcribed interviews, inclusive of careful review of the audio-tapes, and correlation of the field notes and personal observations and the artifacts and documents. Care was taken to ensure that written words in the transcripts
were not taken out of context. According to Seidman (1991) and Glesne and Peshin (1992), it is important that a thorough and complete analyses of all evidence be made in this type of qualitative research, since the significant difference in this type of research is that the interviewer assimilates the environment when present as if a native to the environment under examination, something that is not the norm in most quantitative research. According to Bolman and Deal (1984), through personally viewing each institution, the researcher is able to determine the extent to which either subjective or objective characteristics are applicable within an institution, a factor which assists in arriving at a credible conclusion to the research.

Among the related points which emerged after the original interviews were conducted and the transcripts were analyzed, and as stated above, it became apparent that there was a need for more specific information on the management frames of the institutions as opposed to the management frames of the substance abuse units within the organization to make a further distinction between the units and the organization. Follow-up queries (see Appendix II, the last section of the Semi-Structured Interview Protocol, questions numbered 1 - 7, under Follow-Up) were conducted. These data were also processed with relevant points extracted and fit into the appropriate frames (see below).
Working with the Material

According to Seidman (1990), it is the task of the researcher to listen to the interviewee objectively, to transcribe the interview from an objective, unbiased view and to inductively reduce the data into a manageable form (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972; Ives, 1984; McMahon, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Mitchell, 1987; Harrison, 1987; Seidman, 1991; Glesne, 1992; Schrag, 1992). As suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984) and others, during the process of analysis the goal was to recognize what was of interest in the interview and to reduce the material into a form which is appropriately displayed (Mitchell, 1987; Harrison, 1987; Seidman, 1991; Glesne, 1992; Schrag, 1992).

The procedure included data reduction and data display (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Mitchell, 1987; Harrison, 1987; Seidman, 1991). The data display was accomplished by utilizing columns and table displays as can be found in Chapter IV. The next procedure was performed when the conclusions of the study were drawn; however, as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984) and others, true qualitative analysis should be a continual, repetitive procedure (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972; Ives, Mitchell, 1987; Harrison, Schrag, 1992).

While developing the individual profiles, categorical groupings were utilized to assist in the logical ordering of the data (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Harrison, 1987; Seidman,
Part of the process included the noting of significant passages in the transcript text (Mitchell, 1987; Glesne, 1992; Schrag, 1992). By utilizing a computer sorting program available on Wordperfect Version 5.1, (Copyright 1992; Orem, Utah, USA), as well as most basic software computer programs, and activating the "F9" merge and sort command, the original analysis of the lengthy transcripts were made by going into the document files of the transcripts stored on the computer diskettes and marking the appropriate passages with a code such as HR (abbreviation for human resource frame related information). When all of the passages related to the relevant frame were identified the sorting command was given and transferred to a separate file with the appropriate frame name on the file (in order not to confuse the file with another frame). Utilizing the Bolman and Deal (1984) four frame descriptor elements and extrapolating characteristics common to the four frames, tables were constructed to capture the responses of each director which fit a particular frame. A logical study was then made of the material as suggested by many qualitative researchers such as Seidman (1991) and others (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972; Ives, 1984; McMahon, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Mitchell, 1987; Harrison, 1987; Glesne, 1992.) These procedures
included the basic components of the continuous process of the collection and analysis of data as suggested by numerous qualitative researchers to include Miles and Huberman (1984); Seidman (1991); and others (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972; Ives, 1984; McMahon, 1984; Mitchell, 1992.)

The researcher completed and analyzed the transcribed interviews in order to discern key points of the continuous procedure as suggested by Seidman and others (McMahon, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Mitchell, 1987; Harrison, 1987; Glesne, 1992; Schrag, 1992). The conclusions formed were based on the interviews that were conducted, a combination of facts and interviewer/writer experiences and knowledge were performed (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Mitchell, 1987; Harrison, 1987; Seidman, 1991).
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study has been to identify the organizational dimensions of the administration of substance abuse programs in selected private sectarian institutions of higher education in Texas through examination of a series of oral interviews with the administrators (directors) of these programs. Additional information has been collected from each institution through artifacts and documents as well as through field notes of the researcher. As identified in Chapter I, the research questions are:

1. What is the organizational framework [dimension] through which each of the respective substance abuse program operates? (i.e., the political, structural, human resource, and the symbolic/cultural frames)

2. Which of the Bolman and Deal frames are being utilized?" [predominately]

3. How is the organization visualized by its members? [i.e., from the viewpoint of the administrator]

4. Has reorganization been contemplated? [i.e., reorganization of the substance abuse program or the unit in which it operates]
As stated previously in Chapter III the data in this study were obtained by several methods, chief among which was audio-tape recorded oral interviews conducted with the directors (administrators) of the substance abuse programs at each institution. The administrators answered a series of over one-hundred probing, open-ended, semi-structured questions. A copy of each transcribed interview along with a copy of questions in the semi-structured interview protocol itself can be found in the holdings of the University of North Texas, Willis Library Archives, Denton, Texas. Additional recorded observations from the interviewer's field notes, the original taped interviews, the various catalogs, handbooks, newspapers, recruitment materials, organizational charts and other artifacts from the respective institutions have been placed on file, as well in the Archives in the Willis Library.

As stated above (Chapter III) the semi-structured interview protocol questions were grouped into three major categories: questions to elicit demographic data, including institutional characteristics and characteristics of the administrators; questions to elicit information about the current management frames being used by the administrators; and follow-up interview questions regarding the components of the substance abuse program, and the administrators' viewpoints regarding their units' strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT). Utilizing
Bolman and Deal's (1984) four frames theory, frame questions are further grouped into four areas: political, structural, human resource, and symbolic/cultural (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Bensimon et al, 1989; Rice, 1991). Information gleaned in the study is presented in the order just described, beginning with the demographic data. The order of presentation was by random selection.

**Demographic Characteristics of the Institutions**

It is necessary to understand the institutional framework into which the student services component fits before examining data about the organizational dimension of substance abuse programs in private sectarian institutions of higher education. The institutional demographic data below provides this framework. Sources for institutional data are institutional artifacts and documents and the researcher's field notes.

**DALLAS BAPTIST UNIVERSITY**

Dallas Baptist University (DBU), located at 7777 West Kiest Boulevard on the outskirts of Dallas, is an independent Southern Baptist, comprehensive, coeducational institution with an enrollment of more than two thousand, seven hundred students. It is regionally accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Students are required to reside on the campus through the senior year if receiving financial aid or scholarship. The
institution offers a full range of undergraduate degrees and selected graduate programs. Located atop a hill in western Dallas, the school is surrounded by several acres of park-like grounds, overlooking Mountain Creek Lake, providing a semi-rural setting. The mission statement emphasizes that Dallas Baptist University "exists to provide quality Christian education with the lordship of Christ central in all areas of the University. We seek to integrate faith and learning in each course" (Dallas Baptist University 1992 - 1993 Catalog page 2).

Most student services (except residence life personnel) are housed in the same building with other administrative offices, including the president's office. This two-story facility, constructed in the modern style (post 1950s era), is furnished with deep wine carpeting and period furniture. A receptionist greets the visitor who enters and provides directions in a friendly manner.

Substance abuse at Dallas Baptist University is strictly prohibited, whether possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages or possession and consumption of any illicit drugs. Minimum student sanctions include automatic referral to the University Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention, an office which is not listed by name in the Student Handbook or in the Undergraduate Catalog. All activity associated with alcohol and drug abuse prevention, including education, assessment, discipline and judicial
activities, are handled through the Vice President for Student Affairs.

UNIVERSITY OF DALLAS

The University of Dallas (UD), located at 1845 East Northgate Drive in Irving, is an independent, Roman Catholic coeducational university offering both undergraduate and graduate programs. Primarily a residential campus with an enrollment of more than three thousand five hundred students, the University of Dallas requires all students to live on campus through the junior year.

The school is located atop a hill near the juncture of several busy highways, but it still conveys a semi-rural atmosphere because of the long, wooded entry drive. Wooded parkland surrounds the campus to provide an atmosphere of retreat. Fully accredited, including the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation, the institution's primary purpose is stated as "the pursuit of wisdom and the formation of students in the intellectual and moral virtues... and recovery of the Christian intellectual tradition" (The University of Dallas Catalog 1992 - 93, page 5). The University actively "seeks students of uncommon seriousness, intelligence and spirit..." (The University of Dallas Catalog 1992 - 93, page 6).

The office of the administrator interviewed is housed in the central student union, a major facility constructed of marble, stone, mosaic and ceramic tile which houses only
student-related offices. Furnished informally, the building provides plenty of over-stuffed chairs, a variety of lounges, and a convenient dining service.

Alcohol and drug education is provided through the Coordinator of Substance Education, who is also the Assistant Dean of Students for Residential Life and Student Development. As the Assistant Dean, this individual also provides the disciplinary and judicial components of the program, and may refer the student for assessment and treatment to an outside facility. While the Student Code prohibits "use, possession or distribution of narcotic or other controlled substances...," "students who voluntarily seek assistance are typically not subject to disciplinary action as a result of initiating contact" (The University of Dallas Student Handbook 1992 - 93, page 26).

"Use, possession or distribution of alcoholic beverages" (The University of Dallas Student Handbook 1992 - 93, page 25) except as permitted by the Campus Alcohol Policy, is prohibited, but "underage and immoderate drinking is not tolerated" (The University of Dallas Student Handbook 1992 - 93, page 24). The emphasis of the Campus Alcohol Policy is to "create a healthful climate on campus in regard to alcohol, one in which the student feels free not to drink," (The University of Dallas Student Handbook 1992 - 93, page 24) and the educational component includes a
student organization which promotes responsible alcohol use.

**DALLAS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE**

Dallas Christian College (DCC), located at 2700 Christian Parkway in Farmers Branch, enrolls fewer than one hundred students per year. A coeducational institution, Dallas Christian is affiliated with all Christian churches as well as with the Church of Christ. The primary accreditation for Dallas Christian is the American Association of Bible Colleges (AABC). While serving some commuter students, DCC is primarily a residential campus for undergraduate students. Considering the propinquity to urban Dallas, and especially Lyndon Baines Johnson (LBJ) Freeway, DCC has a pleasant, small campus (22 acres) and the atmosphere is extremely cordial. "The purpose and intent of Dallas Christian College shall be to recruit and train, through a Christian education process, all volunteers who would devote their lives in Christian ministry to others" (Dallas Christian College Catalog 1992 - 93, page 5).

DCC begins substance abuse education with the application, which requires that students promise to "...abstain from ...possession and use of tobacco, illicit drugs and liquor on or off the college grounds" (The Dallas Christian College Student Handbook 1992 - 93, page 14). Students whose behavior becomes a matter of concern "will be approached by the appropriate member of the college staff" (The Dallas Christian College Student Handbook 1992 - 93,
It is the responsibility of the Academic Dean to "provide individual counseling" for off-campus students who "are under the direct supervision of the Academic Dean in all matters of discipline regarding campus regulations" (The Dallas Christian College Student Handbook 1992 -93, page 14). Dormitory students are first the responsibility of the Residence Hall Assistant, then the Residence Hall Supervisor, and finally, the Academic Dean. "Moral behavior problems, including use of drugs, alcohol, tobacco...may be called before the Disciplinary Committee" (The Dallas Christian College Student Handbook 1992 - 93, page 14) composed of the President, Academic Dean and appropriate Residence hall Supervisor. No separate education program specifically for substance abuse exists, but substance abuse education is addressed through outside speakers, literature, programs, etc. While the Academic Dean also functions separately, he functions in relation to disciplinary matters under the direction of the Director of Church and College Relations, who also handles alumni and recruitment functions. In effect, because of the conflict of interest which might arise between disciplinary functions and the development functions of the Director of Church and College Relations, the Academic Dean serves as the Director's substitute for behavior and discipline problems.
Dallas Theological Seminary (DTS), located at 3909 Swiss Avenue in inner-city Dallas, is an independent, non-denominational, graduate-level institution accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Dallas Theological Seminary is coeducational, and it offers abundant on-campus housing for its over twelve-hundred students. DTS sits in the midst of the inner-city of Dallas; however the grounds are impeccable. The institution is like an oasis in the middle of urban deterioration, and the friendly students and staff on the campus are extremely helpful and courteous.

The purpose of the institution is "to prepare men and women for ministry as godly servant-leaders in the body of Christ worldwide" and admits "only students who give evidence of being born again" (The Dallas Theological Seminary Catalog 1992 - 1993, page 10). Students at DTS must "exemplify Christ-controlled living both on and off the campus" (The Dallas Theological Seminary Catalog 1992 - 1993, page 10). "The possession, use and distribution of alcoholic beverages, tobacco, nonprescription and illicit drugs and involvement in other questionable practices are not considered suitable..." (The Dallas Theological Seminary Catalog 1992 - 1993, page 217) behavior for students, according to the Student Handbook (The Dallas Theological Seminary Student Handbook 1992 - 93, page 37). General
counseling is available through the Dean of Students, the Seminary Chaplain and the faculty. Counseling for drug and substance abuse is available to students through the Seminary Counseling Services [at a fee of $17.50 per session]. SCS provides assessment in house. The counseling services report to the Vice President for Student Services and Dean of Students, who is responsible for disciplinary and judicial functions for all cases, i.e., those referred by the Seminary Chaplain, the faculty or the Seminary Counseling Services. Students "who voluntarily seek assistance to correct a drug or alcohol abuse problem will not be subject to disciplinary action as a consequence of such abuse" (The Dallas Theological Seminary Student Handbook 1992 - 1993, page 37) but may become "subject to disciplinary action if the abuse continues" (The Dallas Theological Seminary Student Handbook 1992 - 1993, page 37). The Vice President/Dean of Students may personally handle the case or the "student may be subject to discipline by the Student Affairs Committee" (The Dallas Theological Seminary Student Handbook 1992 - 1993, page 37). Education is handled through "forums scheduled as needed to address issues in this area..." (The Dallas Theological Seminary Student Handbook 1992 - 1993, page 37).

CRISWELL COLLEGE

Criswell College (CC), located at 4010 Gaston in Dallas, is a comprehensive, specialized, coeducational,
independent Baptist college which is regionally accredited with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Criswell College occupies an old but extremely well-maintained building within the inner-city of Dallas and is complete with a fresh coat of designer-coordinated paint, shiny tile floors, and carpeted office and lounge spaces. The employees and students are courteous, helpful and friendly. The College enrolls fewer than five hundred commuter students in both graduate and undergraduate programs, providing "biblical, theological and professional education on both the undergraduate and graduate levels, preparing men and women to serve in Christian ministry" (The Criswell College Catalogue 1992 - 1993, page 7).

Criswell College "believes that the use in any form, of tobacco, alcoholic beverages, or controlled substances is detrimental both to the student's body and to his or her Christian testimony. Consequently, any violation will necessitate disciplinary action" (The Criswell College Student Handbook 1992 - 1993, page 6). Every attempt is made to preclude substance abuse problems by a strenuous screening process which includes individual interviews and multi-paged application documents, including exhaustive reference information. Because the assumption is that there will be no substance abuse problem, no particular educational effort is made. If an infraction occurs, assessment may be done internally, by the Director of
Student Affairs, or externally; judicial and disciplinary action may be taken by the Director or referred to the Student Affairs Committee, which also handles disciplinary and judicial functions.

_LeTourneau University_

LeTourneau University (LU), located at 5710 LBJ Freeway in Dallas, is a non-denominational institution which has in the past been affiliated with the Plymouth Brethren religion. LeTourneau is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). LU enrolls more than one-thousand, two-hundred students in both undergraduate and graduate classes. The Dallas campus, which is housed in a modern (1980s) business and professional complex, was designed exclusively for the returning adult learner; the co-educational Dallas campus does not offer housing. The well-kept facility is appropriate for an urban university.

LeTourneau’s mission statement indicates it is "a Christian institution built upon a foundation of Biblical authority which seeks to glorify God by integrating faith, learning and living" (The LeTourneau University Catalog 1992 - 1993, page 6) and encouraging students to "know Him through His son, Jesus Christ" (The LeTourneau University Catalog 1992 - 1993, page 6). The institution is "dedicated to quality instruction which seeks to educate the whole person through the integration of the Christian faith with
learning," (The LeTourneau University Catalog 1992 - 1993, page 5) admitting only those students who are "most likely to benefit from education presented from this unique perspective" (The LeTourneau University Catalog 1992 - 1993, page 7).

LeTourneau, perhaps more than any other institution participating in the study, expects to encounter zero substance abuse problems within its student population. It is not a residential campus and the LeTourneau Educational Adult Professional program (LEAP) is primarily designed for the more mature adult professional. The University Catalog makes clear that students are expected to abstain from "...use of tobacco or alcoholic beverages and acts which involve drugs..." (The LeTourneau University Catalog 1992 - 1993, page 13). Failure to abide by these policies subjects the student to "disciplinary action," although the University "provides a redemptive procedure with application of the principles of due process" (The LeTourneau University Catalog 1992 - 1993, page 13). On the Dallas campus if the problem originates within a classroom, it may be resolved by the faculty member. If not, it will be referred to the LEAP Director, who has full responsibility for counseling of all student problems, including substance abuse problems. No assessment is available in house, and the LEAP director provides both judicial and disciplinary components himself.
The selected institutions included in this research share major similarities. All are private, co-educational sectarian institutions of higher learning which emphasize the integration of religion with the educational mission. All institutions have student populations of fewer than five thousand (<5,000) students, and all expect the individual who directs the substance abuse effort to handle additional responsibilities. The separate components of substance abuse [education, assessment (in-house or off-site), discipline and judicial] can be found, at least to a minimal extent, on all the campuses, although each campus addresses the problem of substance abuse through a non-differentiated, integrated approach.

The differences among these institutions are perhaps more marked than are the similarities. Each institution has a different religious affiliation; student ages range from the traditional age to the mature, over-traditional-age individual; the enrollments range from fewer than 100 to more than 3,500 students; the programs include a mixture of graduate only, undergraduate only, and both undergraduate and graduate programs, offering a range of degrees from the baccalaureate degree, the master's degree and the doctoral degree; and the selection includes both residential and commuter campuses. The accreditation includes both denominational and secular associations. The substance abuse programs range from a comprehensive program with well-
developed components to the programs with vestigial educational and assessment components and well-developed disciplinary and quasi-judicial (here-in-after to be referred to as judicial and not to be confused with an actual arm of local/state/federal jurisprudence) programs.

As stated at the outset, comprehension of the organization dimension of the substance abuse programs at each institution is the basis for an understanding of the management frames utilized in these programs. The range of differences in institutional characteristics delineated above [size, scope, denominational affiliation, etc.] appear to have no significant bearing on the research topic, since strong similarities of operational philosophy [Christian based] are apparent in all institutions studied.

Demographic Profiles of the Administrators of the Substance Abuse Programs

As explained in Chapter III, interviews of the respective administrators were conducted using the semi-structured interview protocol. Each administrator gave permission for the use of his or her name and the name of the institution in this specific work. A written donor agreement as suggested by Neuenschwander (1985), was obtained prior to the interview. The agreement provided for a review of the typed transcript, after the interview was completed, and required an approval signature by the donor.
Demographic information about the director of the substance abuse program at each institution has been reviewed below to provide background, including general duties, specific substance abuse duties, and the organizational environments in which they perform those duties.

Rick R. Gregory

**Personal:** Vice President for Student Affairs Gregory is thirty-six years old, male, and holds the Doctor of Educational Administration degree.

**Global responsibility:** He is currently responsible for residence life, discipline, health services, student activities, spiritual life, student development, registration, student services, placement, music groups and internal communications, supervising a total of 62 individuals within these contexts.

**Substance abuse responsibility:** The substance abuse program includes an intervention procedure which includes an educational component; assessment, which is required and is done in-house; and both judicial and discipline functions, which are performed totally by Dr. Gregory. The counseling services are separate but are under the auspices of Dr. Gregory. Because the campus has zero tolerance for students who show no remorse regarding an infraction of the substance abuse policy, any substance abuse problem which comes to the attention of any of the staff members he supervises will be referred directly to him.
According to Dr. Gregory, while substance abuse problems are handled in the same way as any other problems, each issue is separate and certain policies may dictate how the problem is dealt with; however, if the student is willing to change and does show remorse, counseling is available. A typical problem, as explained by Dr. Gregory, would be handled by him, for example a discipline referral in which substance abuse problem has occurred. Dr. Gregory stated he would confront the student face to face. If the student admits to the infraction and shows remorse (a judgement on the part of Dr. Gregory), Dr. Gregory could spend as much as an entire day working with this problem, or perhaps even longer. If the student shows no remorse, Dr. Gregory could decide at that time to remove the student for the institution. Dr. Gregory said he spends variable amounts of time involved with substance abuse, depending on the number of students involved and the degree of severity of the problem.

Lisa L. Grubbs

Personal: Assistant Dean of Students Grubbs is a thirty-seven year old female who holds the Doctor of Education degree.

Global Responsibility: Dr. Grubbs handles residential life, student orientation, health services, career development, athletics, sports and recreation, judicial affairs, and everything else outside the classroom.
Substance abuse responsibility: Because the University of Dallas does tolerate the social use of alcohol, Dr. Grubbs serves as the counselor for students who develop abuse problems, as part of the intervention procedure in use at the University of Dallas. She also arranges for situations in which students must be referred for help to public or private services off campus. According to Dr. Grubbs, the institution does not provide internal assessment but has a well-developed educational program which answers to Dr. Grubbs. As indicated above, Dr. Grubbs is also responsible for judicial and disciplinary actions. She handles substance abuse problems in the same way she would handle any other problem, one on one, with an open door policy. Any one of thirty staff members may be involved in the loop which brings the substance abuse problem to Dr. Grubbs. Approximately fifty to sixty individuals, including student services staff members and other faculty/staff volunteers, may be involved in the educational program.

David C. Cotten

Personal: Dr. Cotten is both Vice President for Student Services and Dean of Students. A sixty-five year old male, he holds the degree of Doctor of Ministry.

Global responsibility: He is currently responsible for counseling services, the Chaplain Program, student services and activities, international advisement, and splits
organization advising with the assistant and associate deans, and supervises seven people.

Substance abuse responsibility: Dallas Theological Seminary does not condone use of any substances; thus, all problems or concerns are referred directly to Dr. Cotten. When suspension is not the choice, counseling is performed by a counseling staff member. Separate components of the intervention procedure at the DTS for their substance abuse program include education; assessment, which is performed in house; discipline and judicial, which are primarily the responsibility of Dr. Cotten. The problem rarely goes to the level of the Student Affairs Committee, but if that occurs, the SAC may be involved on the judicial level.

Dr. Cotten handles substance abuse problems as he does any other situation, and that is "one student, one problem, at a time, without prejudice of prior record, and with biblical principles of seeking wise counsel" from above. If the problem cannot be resolved using individual counseling and prayer, Dr. Cotten may have to dismiss the individual, but the person does have the right of appeal to the Student Affairs Committee. Judicial and disciplinary functions are thus handled primarily by Dr. Cotten.

Dr. Cotten believes in keeping the number involved in working with a substance problem as small as possible; however, this changes with the severity of the problem and the level at which it can be resolved, up to and including
the Appeals Committee. While all faculty, staff members or students may call Dr. Cotten's attention to a substance abuse problem, seven immediate staff members would be the only ones to be directly involved in handling such a problem, including counseling. These seven staff members would also be the primary ones involved with education, which is incidental on this campus to all other programming; as would be involved in a substance abuse program.

**Mark C. Worley**

**Personal:** Mr. Worley is a thirty-nine year old doctoral candidate with course work in Higher Education Administration.

**Global responsibility:** As Vice President of College Relations and Director of Church Relations, his areas of responsibility include church and college relations, the inner-city teen program, the choirs, public relations, alumni, athletic recruitment, development, fundraising, student activities and all student events.

**Substance abuse responsibility:** Dallas Christian College does not tolerate substance abuse, but Mr. Worley himself believes that students can be helped if they desire to be. Since the institution is very small, any administrator or faculty member may encounter the student with a substance abuse problem and may be involved in the intervention procedure, and may choose to counsel with the student or may refer the student to Mr. Worley. If the
problem occurs in housing and does not represent a serious offense, it may be resolved by the residence hall staff. Any problem not handled elsewhere will be referred to Mr. Worley for action. He may provide counseling, refer the student to another counselor for in-house assessment, or refer the problem to the Disciplinary Committee. Discipline is placed in the hands of the Disciplinary Committee because Mr. Worley, as public relations officer, needs to be viewed as "the man wearing the white hat." The DCC educational component is generally handled through speakers and other special programs. The judicial component is placed in the hands of the Academic Affairs Committee. The student has the choice of leaving the college or entering a counseling program if an offense has been committed. An additional component may include the Farmers Branch police or professional counseling through the Rapha or Minrith/Meier Clinics.

The number of staff that might handle a substance abuse problem as opposed to the number that would be involved in a substance abuse program varies. If it is a problem, any one or combination of approximately 15 staff members could be involved. If there is an event or program on substance abuse, normally 30 staff members would be involved. In some months as much as 35% of Mr. Worleys time may be exhausted on a substance abuse problem, yet he may spend as little as 5 – 10% of his time on such a problem in other months.
B. Paul Wolfe

**Personal:** As Director of Student Affairs, Chairman of the New Testament Department, and Professor of New Testament Studies, Dr. Wolfe is a thirty-seven year old male who holds the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree (Biblical and Pastoral Studies).

**Global responsibility:** In addition to serving as department chair and faculty member he is responsible for the student council, plans activities, serves as liaison between the student body and the administration, handles student affairs and all aspects of student life, and is responsible for the Encounter Mission and the Student Wives Group.

**Substance abuse responsibility:** At Criswell College no substances are tolerated. When a problem occurs as part of the intervention procedure, he and the staff who work for him first listen to the student, then use a spiritual approach to counseling students with abuse problems, invoking heavenly assistance in solving the problem. At Criswell College there are four separate components of the intervention procedure for the substance abuse program, a vestigial educational component; assessment, done both internally as well as externally; and judicial/disciplinary. If the student is unwilling to seek counseling for the problem, he is dismissed from the college. The Student Affairs Committee is involved in the judicial component, as
well as Dr. Wolfe and other administrators, when appropriate. Dr. Wolfe utilizes the same treatment profile for substance abuse as he does for other problems. The number of staff that would handle the substance abuse problem as well as any program would normally be three. The amount of time contributed to this program ranges between one to five percent of Dr. Wolfe's time.

Robert H. Geiman

**Personal:** Dr. Geiman holds the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) (Education), he is a fifty-five year old male, and the Director, LeTourneau Education for Adult Professionals (LEAP).

**Global responsibility:** He is responsible for all employees and the physical facilities of the Dallas LeTourneau campus, including student services, marketing of the educational program, and ministry assistance, and counseling.

**Substance abuse responsibility:** Since the school policy does not tolerate use of substances as part of the intervention procedure, Dr. Geiman is the individual who takes direct action whenever an infraction occurs, utilizing an evangelical approach. Education is vestigial, (for example, a speaker may be brought in to address the problems related to substance abuse, educational pamphlets regarding substance abuse are available) but emphasizes awareness of substance abuse and the negative outcomes from substance
abuse. No formal in-house assessment is available, because, according to Dr. Geiman, the problem is so infrequent. He handles both judicial and disciplinary actions, dealing with the infraction on a one-to-one, case-by-case basis without additional staff being involved. He believes that the absolute minimal time has to be contributed to this problem, but the total time spent during the week would depend on the case and the severity.

As evidenced above, only one in six administrators is female. The mean age of the administrators is forty-five (45) years of age. Four (4) administrators are between thirty-five and forty years of age (35 - 40); none are between forty and forty-five years of age (40 - 45); one is between fifty and sixty years of age (50 - 60), and one is over sixty (60) years of age.

All but one of the administrators hold doctoral degrees, including the Doctor of Educational Administration, the Doctor of Ministry, the Doctor of Education (in Student Personnel and Guidance), the Doctor of Philosophy (in Biblical and Pastoral Studies), and the Doctor of Philosophy (in Education). The one exception is currently completing coursework toward the Ph.D. in Higher Education (Administration). No common title is shared by the administrators, although two vice presidents, three administrators and one assistant dean direct the respective substance abuse programs. The exact titles of each
administrator, as well as the field of study, further illustrate the diverse placement of the programs within the respective institutions. These titles also represent the varied types of responsibility given to each administrator in addition to the responsibility for the substance abuse program.

The average years of experience of the administrators in positions listed range from less than one (<1) year to greater than five (>5) years. The range equals [<1] to [>5] years. The mean experience equals two and forty-two hundredths (2.42) years per administrator.

As evidenced above, all the administrators have varied, but related titles; however, each administrator's responsibilities varied, a factor which was not always evident from the title. Each administrator's title may also represent the relative levels of power or political influence, as evidenced by the placement of the administrator in the respective school's organizational chart, either closer or farther away from the president. This information is treated further in the section on frames, as it has bearing on both political and structural management frames. The educational background of each administrator is significant in that it may be assumed to color the administrative management style and philosophy of the administrator. This element is also treated further in the frames section.
One variable (which may bear future study as noted below) is that no administrator in any of the respective institutions has served as the administrator of the respective program for more than five and one half (>5.5) years. It was not the purpose of this study to postulate reasons, which may or may not be linked to a growing global concern for the incidence of substance abuse in the general public; however, political implications of this short tenure will be examined in the frames section.

A Comparison of Administrators' Management Styles

Management of students

One set of questions from the semi-structured interview protocol dealt with problem management style as perceived by each administrator. Table 1, below, addresses the various techniques utilized by the administrators in responding to the student's difficulties or concerns, as well as the types of problems commonly dealt with and the procedures and policies for dealing directly with students, i.e., the course of action taken by the respective administrators when responding to various student problems.

As evidenced by Table 1, the administrators deal with a wide variety of problems, including discipline, student development, complaints, student problems, student counseling and special problems of older students. The similarity of the problems is matched by the similarity of
the management styles and techniques used by the administrators to deal with the problems.

Table 1
Management Styles Used on Students: When Dealing With Student or Student Related Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONS</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>PROBLEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>Walk-in; Retention</td>
<td>Create sense of community</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Open door</td>
<td>Converse face to face</td>
<td>Student distress &amp; complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>Converse face to face</td>
<td>Student problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>Open door</td>
<td>Converse</td>
<td>Student problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Open door</td>
<td>Converse</td>
<td>First line of recourse for all complaints; student counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Open door</td>
<td>Works with facts only</td>
<td>Older student problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The management styles of each of the administrators interviewed display many similarities. It is clear that the administrators share the same management philosophy with respect to students, reflecting the humanistic management approach. This information will be treated at greater length in the frames section.

**Program needs and problems**

Table 2 describes the program needs and problems expressed by each of the administrators interviewed, the size of the staff supervised, the other units with whom he or she interact, and the supervisor to whom he or she reports. The data represent a personal perspective of the directors of the private sectarian institutions of higher education.

The majority of the administrators interviewed, as illustrated in the table above under the category of "need", cited financial resources as being the most significant problem facing their units and organizations. As the data indicate, the problems facing all of the administrators interviewed can be traced primarily to a lack of adequate funding and the resulting difficulties caused by the lack of funding such as the shortage of personnel. According to Miller (1982) these problems can create and cause a significant amount of stress in personnel relationships;
however, the directors were aware of the impact of these inadequacies and application of the methods available under the political frame may be appropriate if properly utilized.

Additional questions were asked about each unit's effective operation and failures, with the following results:

Most of the failures reported by the administrators are closely related to the funding issues listed in Table 2. Considering the above failures and needs, the researcher also enquired regarding the potential for reorganization of the administrator's unit. Four out of the six institutions included in the study reported that change is either currently taking place or has taken place within the last five years. Each administrator interviewed also felt there were one or more areas of improvement needed for his or her unit. [The strategic planning module would be an appropriate application during these times of change for the various units as suggested by authors such as Keller (1983); Morrison, et al, (1984); Cope, (1987); and Steeples, (1988).]

The relationships each administrator must maintain for his or her unit, both those relationships that deal with other cooperating departments and the reporting relationships the administrators maintain, were also dealt with in Table 2, below. All administrators interviewed, with the exception of Dallas Baptist University, report
working with a majority of the primary units on their campuses. Dallas Baptist University works with only a limited number of other offices. In response to a further question about working relationships, all the administrators interviewed stated that they were able to get along well with others within their respective institutions. Two administrators went so far as to say these relationships were "trouble-free".

The reporting relationships among all institutions were also very similar. The administrators interviewed reported directly to the president in all but two instances, which involve reporting to the Dean of Students and the Dean of External and Graduate Studies, respectively.

As explained previously, due to the fact that all of the substance abuse programs are handled as a diffused or particalized programs, the number of people supervised by each administrator interviewed is relatively large, with the mean number of personnel supervised being forty-one. The range is fourteen (14) to ninety-one (91). Despite the size of the staff, each administrator indicated that the working environment within the unit is informal. Additional information gathered about the related field of required evaluations performed on each administrator indicated that evaluations were performed with some frequency in all but one institution, the University of Dallas, and that two institutions include students in the evaluation process.
Program Needs and Problems: Number of Staff Directed; Other Units Worked With; and Whom Supervises the Administrator

In Table 2, below, program needs and problems, number of staff directed other units worked with, and whom supervises the administrator of the substance abuse programs are depicted. In each cell is listed the responses which each administrator established as his or her needs, the number of personnel supervised, the number of other areas the administrator works with, within the organization. The supervisor of each administrator is listed as well.
Table 2

Program Needs and Problems: Number of Staff Directed; Other Units Worked With; and Whom Supervises the Administrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTE</th>
<th>NEEDS</th>
<th>DIRECTS # OF STAFF</th>
<th>WORKS WITH OTHER UNITS</th>
<th>SUPERIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>Staff Resources</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Admissions Academic Affairs Academ'nt Advancem't Devel'ment Campus services</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Facilities Resources Staff</td>
<td>50 - 75</td>
<td>All areas but well defined; but much cross-over</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Staff Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>President &amp; Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>Resources Staff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Academics Business</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Resources Staff Advisors Time Faculty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>All Areas esp. VP Academic Affairs Registrar Student Recruitment</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Financial aid Staff Library Coor w/main campus services</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Office of Financial aid Personnel Academic chairs Main campus student services</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate School &amp; External Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3**  
Promotion, Rewards for Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>HOW DO YOU GET AHEAD?</th>
<th>REWARDS FOR ACHIEVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>Be confident; be true to people; share the vision</td>
<td>Internal promotions; appreciation expressed by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Produce; participate in job; politics</td>
<td>Five and ten year certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Participate in appropriate committees, boards, staff meetings, meetings</td>
<td>Commendations (both written &amp; verbal); pay; appreciation by students; written personal comments (frequently from the president); annual appreciation dinners; merit raises, personal satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>Work hard</td>
<td>Merit raises; personal satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Do job faithfully; demonstrate vision</td>
<td>Financial, professional enhancement; personal praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>See quality improve; see progress affect lives of our students</td>
<td>people do not work for financial compensation; focus on involvement &amp; quality impacting lives of students; human expression; serve Jesus Christ &amp; intrinsic rewards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed above are the administrators' responses to the question of his or her perceptions of what has to be done in the organization in order to further his or her career. Rewards for achievement in the organization are also listed.

In Table 3, above, the administrators' responses are recorded regarding their respective perceptions of the actions necessary for promotion and the realization of achievement from their supervisors.

As indicated above, the administrators who participated in the study believed, on the whole, that humanistic values were important to promotion and the expression of approval for a job well done. Only at the University of Dallas was there a feeling that politics has a primary influence upon promotion (Bolman & Deal, 1984; 1988; Bensimon, et al, 1989; Rice, 1991).

The administrators were questioned about job satisfaction, as well. Interview questions were also asked about each administrators personal work satisfaction. All the administrators' reported a high level of satisfaction with his or her position and a high level of personal involvement in their respective positions.

Visualization of Institution

The related area of the administrator's visualization of his or her organization was researched by means of
### Table 4

**Visualization of Institution: by the Administrator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTITUTION</th>
<th>OVERALL MISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>Commitment to excel, try to do things first class, freedom to do job and set goals, treat people with dignity and respect, make mistakes and learn from them</td>
<td>Integrate faith into the learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Varied, not boring, exciting, creative, challenging</td>
<td>Tied into the university mission, very diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Very active, very challenging, believe the amount of interaction with students brings challenges and pleasure, quality and excellence, integrity in character development</td>
<td>Prepare men and women to be godly servants leaders to serve church and world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>Fun and intense conservative, morally to the right</td>
<td>Quality education in a quality environment, Christian atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Best kept secret, pleasant, void of power struggles</td>
<td>Purpose and mission to train Christian ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Real simple community, focus directly on what affects lives</td>
<td>Serve Jesus Christ and by offering excellent prayer and equality spirited instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
questions regarding how each administrator would describe the institution to a friend and the overall mission of the organization. The responses, recorded above, in Table 4, are congruent with the observations and with the stated mission as found in each institution's printed catalog.

The table above also indicates a high degree of satisfaction on the part of all the administrators interviewed and a high level of pride in his or her institutions. The verbal description of the institution's mission was, in all cases, almost a direct quotation of the printed mission statement, indicating an excellent match between the employee and the institution.

Visualization of the Organization

An important aspect of this research project was to determine how each administrator interviewed in the selected private sectarian institutions of higher education visualized his or her organization. Data pertinent to this issue was isolated from the transcripts and presented in Table 4, above. Almost unanimously, the participants in the study described their visualizations in human resource terminology, the strongest indication that they are all human resource managers as suggested by Bolman and Deal (1984); Bensimon et al., (1989) and Rice (1991). Their human resource emphasis extended to encompass the entire institution, reflecting a consistency of frame across the
organization. An additional concern was the amount of change the unit has undergone within the past five years, and responses on this subject was also isolated and examined. One administrator interviewed (LeTourneau University) reported that constant change is the norm in his operation because of constant growth. Another (Dallas Baptist University) indicated that reorganization was taking place at the current time and will continue. At the University of Dallas reorganization has taken place within the last five years but that reorganization was the first significant change since the current dean came in as a graduate student. At one institution the administrator interviewed stated that he would now consider, since this study has been performed, re-examining how he currently views his perspective of the substance abuse program.

At The Dallas Theological Seminary the greatest change reported was how the unit functions currently, especially in regard to currently holding regular staff meeting; five years ago Dallas Theological Seminary had inaugurated the Executive Committee; the faculty was reorganized (previously was a senate), now full faculty meetings are required. All other institutions reported continuing changes within the past five years. In all instances save one, LeTourneau University, the changes have moved the administrator interviewed continuously closer to operating comprehensively within the human resource frame, which complements the human
resource frame in operation in the entire institution. When reorganization has taken place or has been contemplated it has, even in time of dwindling resources, still remained tied to a human resource mission statement in placing its personnel and students first and foremost.

**Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, & Threats**

As referred to in Chapter III, there were follow-up questions in the semi-structured interview protocol designed to address certain areas that may have needed to be further developed [see Appendix II]. During the follow-up portion of the interviewing protocol the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) to each unit were addressed. Each administrator's perceptions in these four areas was recorded and has been made part of the transcript. Results of the follow-up interviews indicated that every administrator interviewed concurred in believing that his or her unit's major strength lay in providing individualized, even personalized, services to students in an environment which encourages the ultimate in personal and spiritual development. A further strength for each unit was dedicated personnel who perceive their major reason for employment to be serving students. The chief weakness for the majority of institutions was the lack of financial resources, with one exception. One institution saw both a weakness and a threat in its uncontrolled growth which, if left unchecked, may
jeopardize the basic framework of operation for the unit. The largest threat for the majority of the institutions was the loss of quality personnel. All units agreed that their greatest opportunities lay in recruiting and training their students to become servant leaders, dedicated to the religious principles of the institution.

Organizational Framework Preferred by Program Director

The purpose of this study was to identify the organizational dimension (framework) through which each of the respective substance abuse programs operates [i.e., the political, structural, human resource, and the symbolic/cultural frames]. In order to analyze the preferred management frame (framework/dimension) of each administrator participating in the study, the typed transcript of each interview was read carefully numerous times, passages pertaining to administrative management issues and research questions were flagged, isolated and analyzed in the context of the four frames and classified according to the relevant frame. The statements below provide a practical basis for capturing the essence of the experiential situations while focusing on the comprehension of those experiences. The frame charts were constructed utilizing, where possible, the original words of each administrator interviewed as suggested by Siedman (1991) as
well as intentionally deleting the insignificant emergent or redundant data.

Frame 1: Human Resource Frame

Evidences and characteristics of management from the human resource lens as outlined by Bolman and Deal (1984); Bensimon et al., (1989); and Rice (1991), are contained in Frame 1, (Table 5) below. The responses of each administrator interviewed which fit one or more of these broad human resource categories, are displayed below in tabular form for convenience in presentation of the data.

As evidenced in the table below, all institutions in this study showed many characteristics of the human resource management frame. One administrator interviewed at Dallas Baptist University indicated that his unit strives for a high congruence between the stated purpose of the institution, i.e., the integration of religious faith into the academic learning process, and the conduct of the substance abuse program. While the university does provide substance abuse counseling and develops specific programs to help people, most of the time the unit concentrates on provision of information to students who are concerned to live by a value system which precludes substance abuse. On the rare occasions when a student requires serious disciplinary action, the administrator interviewed feels that the recruitment process has failed in its task. He reports that he is included in decisions made about his unit and that
staff morale is good. He and his staff work hard but enjoy it.

The director at the University of Dallas also relies on a high congruence between the students recruited and the stated university mission statement, i.e., given the type of student who holds such values, her unit seeks to focus on their satisfaction in the university environment. All decisions regarding the handling of substance abuse problems are left within the unit, and the staff is characterized by good morale.

One administrator interviewed (Dallas Christian College) was chagrined at the loss of a staff member because the college was unable to remain competitive with salaries. The director himself had been tempted by an offer made by another institution. After talking with the president of the college, and some soul-searching, he was, however, able to make some financial adjustments and remained at the college.

One institution (Dallas Theological Seminary) provides scheduling books left open on a central counter, in the main lobby of the president's offices, so that students can assign a convenient time to come in to talk. The student can come in, examine the book, write in the time wanted or if immediate help is needed, someone will be available to meet with the student at that time.
Table 5

Human Resource Frame Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>PERSONNEL &amp; STUDENTS OF PRIME CONCERN</th>
<th>EMPHASIS ON MEETING HUMAN NEEDS</th>
<th>DEMOCRATIC DECISION MAKING</th>
<th>POSITIVE MOTIVATION/MORALE</th>
<th>COMMON COMMITMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>&quot;Recruit ment failed&quot; RE: &quot;discipline problem&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Develops programs to help people&quot;</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>&quot;Works hard, but enjoys work&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Integrates faith into the learning process&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>&quot;Doing well in certain kind of student&quot;</td>
<td>Self-satisfaction, statement &quot;focus on students&quot;</td>
<td>Decision making left within the unit</td>
<td>&quot;yesyesyes&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Local in the university&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS3</td>
<td>evidence from recruit ment literature and helps &quot;prepare for life's work and service&quot;</td>
<td>Sufficient client funding so can hire more people</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Very compatible, enjoy working together</td>
<td>Prepare men and women to be costly servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Satisfaction when students doing well &amp; achieving</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Fun intense quality education in a Christian atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>In advisor-mentor relationship adding administrator as troubleshooter/assistant student services</td>
<td>&quot;The student/faculty battle&quot;</td>
<td>Yes &amp; involved in decisions affecting him or his unit</td>
<td>Support quality to do &amp; be what ought to be done</td>
<td>Train Christian ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Consider focus &amp; commitment</td>
<td>&quot;Focus directly on what affects lives&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Be chosen to go to work at LU even though less money</td>
<td>Serve Jesus Christ by offering quality programs &amp; quality spiritual instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel/Students of prime concern: evidence that faculty, staff, and students considered of prime importance, such as high concern for good student/institutional match; and acceptance of fault for student failure.
Emphasis on meeting human needs: evidence of high emphasis on meeting human needs, such as willingness to negotiate salary to meet individual needs and provision of student access to external amenities.
Democratic decision making: system of organization for participative, democratic decision-making, such as full faculty meetings; Positive motivation/morale: tangible evidence of high positive motivation/morale, such as cleanliness of physical plant, cordiality of university community members, statements from interviewees, general attitude of helpfulness; and Common commitment: evidence of a common commitment such as control of smoking behavior by group norms.
Dashes (-) within the response boxes represent absence of applicable response.

Members of the organization were the primary resources. The administrators interviewed placed their people as number one and financial problems were only problems because it kept them from having or keeping (as in the case of Dallas Christian College) the desired faculty, staff, or students. The concern was that it was of primary focus to design the institution in order to meet human needs.

Frame 2: Political Frame
Evidences and characteristics of administrative management as determined through the political lens as outlined by Bolman and Deal (1984); Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989); and Rice (1991) are contained in Frame 2 below. The responses of each administrator interviewed, which fit one or more of these broad political categories, are abbreviated below in tabular form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INST</th>
<th>NEGOTIATING</th>
<th>BARGAINING</th>
<th>COERCION</th>
<th>SPECIAL INTERESTS</th>
<th>COALITIONS</th>
<th>POWER DISTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>by org chart only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>alumni affairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>by org chart only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Negotiation:** as when managers compete for limited resources; **bargaining:** as when managers strike agreements and compromises relating to dwindling resources; **coercion:** or use of power or position to force situations, resources, or services to favor a manager's area; **special interests:** representing use of services, resources, or programs of the institution to benefit a single unit or to benefit personal interests; **Coalitions:** or agreements employing the joint power of two or more like-minded units or managers to benefit their respective areas; **distribution of power, or power of position:** resulting from clear delineations of managerial "clout" not necessarily (and not usually) along the lines of the organizational chart.
Conflict, negotiation, bargaining, coalitions, coercion distribution of power, special interests are common terms found within the political frame but was uncommon verbiage in the institutions researched (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Bensimon, et al, 1989; Rice, 1991). Conflict is the primary ingredient separating the political frame from the human resource frame and the structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Bensimon, et al, 1989; Rice, 1991).

Frame 3: Structural Frame

Mechanistic hierarchies with firm lines of classic organization structure, significantly refined during the scientific management era by Frederick W. Taylor and Max Weber, characterize the structural frame which are consistent with various authors such as Nigro and Nigro (1973); Bolman and Deal (1984); Bensimon et al., (1989); Daft (1989); Owen (1991); and Rice (1991). Bureaucracies, such as the military, the Federal government structure, General Motors Corporation and the former American Telephone and Telegraph Company are examples of classic bureaucracies according to Bolman and Deal (1984). These entities are characterized by firm rules and structural lines, well-defined mechanistic and authoritarian hierarchies, comprehensive planning, usually synchronized by the president, and, in most such organizations, a larger-than-life president or chief executive. Responses of the administrators interviewed,
which could be categorized as structural, are listed in the table below.

The responses, particularly by Dallas Baptist University and the University of Dallas, reflect almost total unconcern for the structural frame. Responses of the only other two institutions to reflect this frame in terms of the president only. View of the president reflects terminology common to strategic planning, especially in academic administration according to authors such as Keller (1983) and others (Morrison, et al, 1984; Cope, 1987; Steeples, 1988) with the recorded responses "visionary".

Mechanistic hierarchies with firm lines of classic organization structure that were significantly refined during the scientific management era are not really appropriate within the collegial setting as reported by such authors as Bensimon et al., (1989); Rice (1991), and others (Nigro & Nigro, 1973; Bolman & Deal, 1984; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Daft, 1989; Deal & Kennedy, 1990; Owen, 1991) of the selected private sectarian institutions and especially the substance abuse programs. As reported by one institution, Dallas Baptist University, the title vice president is ominous to students. The titles such as vice president are "foreboding" titles. Utilizing the structural frame is not appropriate to the student services areas because there is not a clearcut, cookie cutter approach to decision making. The best decision is not necessarily the one that can be executed when dealing with each individual student. The ability to analyze
problems and determine alternate solutions is a better option operating within the structural frame according to Bolman and Deal (1984); Bensimon et al., 1989; and Rice, 1991.

Table 7

Structural Frame Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>MECHANISTIC HIERARCHY</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE WITH DIRECTIVE</th>
<th>PRESIDENT LARGER THAN LIFE</th>
<th>PRESIDENT SYNCHRONIZES ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>EXTENSIVE PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>preferred not to provide org. chart</td>
<td>yes, when given</td>
<td>&quot;man of vision&quot;</td>
<td>participatory management</td>
<td>yes, but flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>laughed; &quot;org. cheese-cake&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>realistic</td>
<td>faculty/staff participate</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS</td>
<td>org. chart not important</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>fund terms</td>
<td>participatory management</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>does not apply</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;man of vision&quot;</td>
<td>combination of management methods</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>insignificant</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>full faculty meetings</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes-new to job</td>
<td>realistic terms</td>
<td>semi-participatory</td>
<td>desires more planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mechanistic hierarchies: such as in highly structured organizations;
Compliance with directives: high compliance with directives common to organizations in which personnel rigidly adhere without questions to written and verbal directives;
President considered larger than life: often found within organizations that are extremely structured;
Extensive/Comprehensive planning: well structured organizations utilize comprehensive planning;
Dashes and quotations within the response boxes represent the same as in the preceding tables.
All institutions surveyed had fewer than 5,000 student population campuses. According to various authors it is to be expected that the rate of ambiguity increases as the institution size increases, as well as the level of complexity, even in the most structurally well defined institutions, and therefore it could be expected in these institutions studied, because of the relatively small student population, the institutions would be less complex (McMahon, 1984; Bolman & Deal, 1984; Guthrie & Reêd, 1986; Daft, 1989; Owen, 1991; Rice, 1991). Frame 4: Symbolic/Cultural Frame

According to Ponder (1987), "The creation of a specific position or department to coordinate and direct alcohol- and drug-use policy could improve university efforts..." (page 86). Each institution studied has individual needs, even though each institution included in the study is religiously oriented with similar expectations. The operationalizing of programs (whether student service oriented or not) requires utilization of all organizational frames to avoid narrowness and maximize effective operation; administrative action taken in full awareness of institutional characteristics is required to reach this goal according to Bolman and Deal (1984) and others (Bensimon, et al, 1989; Rice, 1991). These authors also agree that the utilization of the theoretical frames allows a more complete observation of the total process of the organization.
Table 8
Symbolic/Cultural Frame Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INST</th>
<th>LEGEND</th>
<th>TRADITION</th>
<th>EVENTS EXPLAINED</th>
<th>ENFORCERS</th>
<th>MYTHS</th>
<th>CEREMONIES</th>
<th>&quot;THE GOLDEN BANANA&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wished for traditional campus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>chapel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>&quot;the dean&quot;</td>
<td>strong traditional campus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legends: Tradition/Myth/Ceremony: usually take years to develop, found in older institution;
Events explained: advantage of symbolic/cultural frame, especially when there is lack of structured environment;
Enforcers: common in older institutions, serve a purpose in assisting in informing personnel about organizational rules/procedures/sanctions;
Stories: (such as the Gold Banana) help carry on organizational legends about rewards for personnel;
Dashes/Quotations: (within response boxes) same as previously utilized in frames above.
Because the institutions studied were all primarily new or relatively new institutions, it was expected (of no surprise) to lack in depth of tradition, which is in agreement with Kennedy and Deal (1982). The Dallas Baptist University administrator interviewed reported a wish for tradition; however, coupled with age and the fact that Dallas Baptist University is predominantly a commuter school, a greater emphasis is placed on fellowship, communion with God, and brotherly love and compassion.

According to Bolman and Deal (1984) and others, the building of legends, traditions, myths, ceremonies would take time, as well as needing a more ivy league college atmosphere in which these realms could develop (Bensimon, et al., 1989; Deal & Kennedy, 1990; Rice, 1991). There are a plethora of advantages to be derived from utilizing legends, traditions, myths, ceremonies and other entities which are common to the symbolic/cultural frame, and according to various authors, the chief advantage being that they serve important functions within the organizations as well as the society at large (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Bensimon, et al., 1989; Deal & Kennedy, 1990; Rice, 1991). According to Bolman and Deal (1984) they serve to "socialize, stabilize, reduce anxiety, and ambiguities" (page 159). The organizations studied are rich in personnel that have high levels of communication skills and therefore this frame does not impact upon the organizations as significantly as it would if there were severe inadequacies in these areas, which is in agreement with Bolman and Deal (1984). A residential environment contributes
significantly to creating tradition, which is the essence of the symbolic/cultural frame (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Bensimon, et al., 1989; Deal & Kennedy, 1990; Rice, 1991).

All these institutions had mandatory chapel attendance; this is perhaps one way that the symbolic/cultural frame can be developed; however, once again the Roman Catholic environment at the University of Dallas is more steeped in tradition. According to Bolman and Deal (1984) and others this is particularly essential to the symbolic/cultural frame (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Bensimon, et al., 1989; Deal & Kennedy, 1990; Rice, 1991).

The administrators interviewed at each of the selected private sectarian institutions of higher education are unanimously operating in the human resource frame, as illustrated in the Human Resource Frame Table found in the previous section. The table (above) addresses the prevalent characteristics of the administrators interviewed in the selected private sectarian institutions of higher education and substantiates their a) concern for personnel and students; b) democratic decision making; c) high morale and positive motivation; and d) common commitment, further substantiating the theories of Bolman and Deal (1984), and others (Maslow, 1970; Bensimon, et al., 1989; DeCarvalho, 1991; Owen, 1991; Rice, 1991).
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summation

Introduction

The semi-structured interview protocol was rendered to each of the administrators of substance abuse programs in the selected private sectarian institutions of higher learning with the objective of obtaining sufficient data to identify the organizational dimensions of substance abuse programs (by applying the Bolman and Deal (1984) multifaceted lens to the administration of these programs) to identify the frames through which they operate.

The study was conducted because very little information has previously been formulated about substance abuse programs in small, urban private sectarian institutions, and therefore, little was known about these programs. The analysis of the data was presented in various forms including narrative and the utilization of tables to facilitate interpretation. The data base was contracted to be a one hundred percent (100%) completion of the semi-structured protocol questions in oral interviews of the directors of the substance abuse programs in the accredited private sectarian institutions selected for study. That goal was achieved, with a total of one hundred percent
(100%) of the oral interviews being completed, including initial and follow-up interviews.

**Summation of Data Applicable to the Four Frames**

As noted throughout all the interview protocols, each administrator stated that he or she placed primary emphasis on participative management and leadership styles. As reported by these administrators this type of management style works particularly well within relatively small institutions, and all institutions in the study possessed student bodies of 5,000 or less. Findings in other studies regarding organizational structure indicate that the rate of ambiguity will increase as the institution size and level of complexity increases, even in the most structurally well defined institutions [Duncan (1990); White (1990); Hall (1991); Birnbaum (1989), Bolman and Deal (1984); Guthrie and Reed (1985); Chaffee and Tierney (1988); Meyer and Rowan (1988); Bensimon et al., (1989); McMahon (1984); Daft (1989); Deal and Kennedy (1990); Owen (1991); Rice, (1991)]. Consistent with these findings, the institutions studied are less complex in management structure and relative ambiguity, with both students and personnel having free access to administrators.

The findings of this study are consistent with the application of Bolman and Deal's (1984) four frames theory, with the preferred management style holding consistent across the frames (Bolman and Deal, 1984; Bensimon et al.,
1989; Hall, 1991; Rice, 1991). While the administrators who were interviewed utilize a variety of management tools for viewing and understanding the organization of which they are a part, one frame, the Human Resource Frame, is used more consistently than any other.

As indicated in Chapter III, considerable analysis of the data, utilizing the transcribed interviews, careful review of the audio-tapes, and correlation of the field notes and personal observations with artifacts and documents, was basic to achieving the above conclusion. Care was taken to ensure that written words in the transcripts were not taken out of context. According to Seidman (1991) and Glesne and Peshin (1992), it is important that a thorough and complete analysis of all evidence be made in this type of qualitative research, since the significant difference in this type of researcher is that the interviewer assimilates the environment when present "as if a native to the environment under examination," something that is not the norm in most quantitative research. According to Bolman and Deal, through personally viewing each institution, the researcher is able to determine the extent to which either subjective or objective characteristics are applicable within an institution, a factor which assists in arriving at a credible conclusion to the research.
Human Resource Frame

Institutions which show consistent, pervasive concern about the welfare and the thoughts, feelings and attitudes of their students and employees are categorized by Bolman and Deal (1984) as fitting the human resource frame. As the display of data in the four frame tables in Chapter IV illustrates, the administrators have moved continuously closer to operating comprehensively within the human resource frame, which complements the human resource frame for their entire institutions. Within the last five years, four out of the six institutions reported that change is either currently taking place or has taken place, in the unit in which the administration of the substance abuse programs operates. Yet, when reorganization has taken place or has been contemplated it has, even in a time of dwindling resources, remained tied to a human resource mission statement in placing its personnel and students first and foremost.

It might be expected in student services that the emphasis would be placed on the human resource framework; however, because "God" is an integral part of the orientation of the private sectarian substance abuse programs (see mission statements), more concrete emphasis is placed on the human condition. Compassion is therefore a more commonly accepted situation and thus more prominent and visible in these systems. The emphasis is upon respect for
individuals, especially recognition that each student in the private sectarian institution is not only an individual but an individual with a "soul." The human resource frame is openly apparent in these institutions, further substantiating Bolman and Deal's theories that this is to be expected in a high consensus environment.

Each of the institutions studied had a strong, common mission statement which further substantiated the human resource frame, resulting administration of units that were operationally well managed, low conflict environments where heavy emphasis is placed on caring and concern. Substance abuse problems are dealt with, for the most part, in an informal, unstructured way which seeks the welfare of the individual as a member of the entire organization. The students of each of the institutions included in this study are truly in the number one place on each campus, and it is ingrained into the hearts of the administrators who deal with substance abuse.

The human resource orientation of each administrator was illustrated in the interview situations themselves. Communication was open in all systems studied, and as stated in Chapter III, even though the main interviews were scheduled to last for an initial two hours, the interviews usually exceeded four hours, an extension suggested and agreed upon by each director, regardless of his/her busy schedule. Length of the follow-up interviews depended upon
the number of points where clarity was necessary, but each follow-up interview request was met with the same courtesy and cooperation as had been shown at the initial interview. This confirms a genuine interest in the students, because even when it comes to a very difficult subject such as substance abuse, each administrator was willing to expend a great deal of precious time, energy, and effort to participate in the study.

Despite the concerns regarding fiscal resources apparent in most of the institutions, the management emphasis was centered upon students and their needs, not upon the needs of management. It was as if there were adequate funding for all programs. The personnel reflected the mission statements of these institutions and there was an apparent deep-seated sense of security in that they thought money did not have to be the root or the major reason they were at their respective institutions. Through constant monitoring and integrating of mission statements, including meeting goals and objectives, these organizations remained focused and on track for accomplishment of their goals and objectives. Excellence is part and parcel of these institutions. Turning students into leaders is of prime importance. Mistakes are allowed and are turned into learning experiences.

In the area of higher education, the general Christian concept (see mission statements in the previous chapter) is
perhaps one of two significant factors that impacts on the differences between the public institutions and private sectarian institutions, and this coupled with the legal limitations on public institutions (see Kaplan, 1989) are truly significant factors. Public institutions can remove religion or the concept of religion from the mission statement; however, the strong sense of values enmeshed in these institutions is the essential difference between the public and private institutions. Everything in the private sectarian institutions studied is based on the concept of Christianity and religion. Therefore, the management style in these institutions is also based on these same premises. A significant problem common to each of the selected private sectarian institutions, as well to the majority of public higher education institutions still surviving in the United States today in a severely depressed economy, is the problem of insufficient funding. This problem impacts upon each of the private sectarian institutions included in this study, with similar end results: inadequate numbers (or loss) of staff and inadequate facilities. All of the selected institutions investigated reported a need for additional staff and the need for more financial resources either for facilities and programming, or for staff. According to Miller (1982) these problems can create and cause a significant amount of stress in personnel relationships; however, the directors were aware of the impact of these
inadequacies. Application of the methods available under the political frame may be appropriate if properly utilized.

It is not possible in public institutions of higher education to bring "God" into the management of the substance abuse program; to do so would violate case law (Kaplin, 1985); however, the human resource frame is still an acceptable frame within public institutions' student service programs. The missing element in the management of these programs may only differ because "God" and specific denominational religious concepts are not allowed in public institutions, although some public institutions do use the concept of a higher power (i.e., the twelve-step program utilized by Alcoholics Anonymous). The element of a commonly agreed-upon moral and religious system, available only to schools chartered as religious institutions, provides virtually free reign to the managers in the handling of substance abuse problems. The courts have left these institutions relatively free from interference and control, especially under constitutional constraints.

In conclusion, the administrators interviewed in the selected private sectarian institutions of higher learning are operating within the human resource frame. The human resource frame is an appropriate frame of operation for the administrators of these substance abuse programs. In as much as the data indicate, the problems facing all of the administrators interviewed can be traced primarily to a lack
of adequate funding and the resulting difficulties caused by the lack of funding such as the shortage of personnel.

Structural Frame

The structural frame was an insignificant frame minimally utilized at each institution. The structural frame is a commonly utilized frame when conflict is a common source of problems, but all administrators reported predominantly conflict-free environments. This also documents Bolman and Deal's (1984) theory because conflict was not a common source of problems in the institutions studied. The structural frame was definitely not uppermost at any institution, despite the fact that financial concerns exist on all but one campus and that most of the organizations have had some reorganization take place within the past one to five years. One school expressed concern with having to justify the existence of the student services area but all other schools seem to be managing their financial constraints, and one school has recently added staff. The evidence, displayed in the frame tables in Chapter IV, indicates that the structural frame is being utilized but only in less significant ways.

Symbolic/Cultural Frame

The symbolic/cultural frame was another frame of low importance within the selected institutions. As displayed
in the frame charts, there was no significant evidence that the symbolic/cultural frame was being utilized to any great extent in any of the substance abuse programs at the selected institutions. All the institutions had clearly defined mission statements as the primary focus of the institutional goals and objectives. Because the institutions studied were all primarily new or relatively new institutions, it was expected that they would lack in depth of tradition. The administrators appreciate the essence of the symbolic/cultural frame and understand the importance of tradition and beliefs. As had been expected, the only school on target for the symbolic/cultural frame was the University of Dallas, since the Roman Catholic religion is a very old-world and traditional religion.

Instilling beliefs and developing traditions that grow with time is of interest to at least one other institution in the study, but the building of legends, traditions, myths and ceremonies is understood to take time as well as a more "ivy league" college atmosphere, including a residential campus. A plethora of advantages can be derived from using legends, traditions, myths, ceremonies, etc., chief among which is that they serve important functions within the organization, as well as within society at large. According to Bolman and Deal (1984), they serve to "socialize, reduce anxiety, and ambiguities (page 150)." The administrative management styles of the individuals interviewed reflect
very little influence of the symbolic/cultural frame in its traditional sense, as understood and presented by Bolman and Deal, yet, as reported by the administrators, they are rich in personnel that have high levels of communication skills. Perhaps for this reason, the absence of the symbolic/cultural frame does not impact upon the organizations as significantly as it would if there were severe deficiencies in the area of communication skills. It was the opinion of the administrators that they did an excellent job in the management of their programs and their members of the units understood what their respective duties were and worked together in harmony for accomplishing goals while continuously focused upon the institution mission statement (please see institutional mission statement excerpts in Chapter IV). This supports Bolman and Deals' (1984) premise that the symbolic/cultural frame is "less obvious when everyone is clear about the job to be done and everyone agrees on the best way to do it" (page 236).

Political Frame

Evidence from the statements of each administrator (see frame charts) led to the conclusion that the administrators interviewed at all institutions surveyed are operating predominately outside the political frame and, indeed, seem largely to ignore that frame. In the identification of the structure, it was clearly understood at each organization
that students were number one. This clearly identifies a bottom-up institution: the students are the established reason for existence; the management is there only because of the students, and they would not be there for any other reason than meeting the students' needs, first and foremost. This was reflected by the overwhelming, unanimous open-door policy for the students and a practice of open communications within the substance abuse programs.

Even though each school reflects a considerable amount of change, the change has taken place in a low conflict environment, further validating Bolman and Deal's (1984) human resource frame, where even in change, a balance is maintained between human needs and formal values. Even where the director displayed a keen awareness of the political frame, the philosophical orientation of the individual was to place student needs before the needs of the institution or their personal needs.

The administrators stated that they believed their respective programs operated as informal groups. There were no significant responses that reinforced the political frame with the groups in power plays against one another for control or dominance over other individual units or the institution in its entirety. Conflict, negotiation, bargaining, coalitions, coercion, distribution of power and special interests are common terms found within the political frame which were uncommon verbiage in the
institutions researched. Conflict, which is the primary ingredient separating the political frame from the human resource and structural frames, was virtually nonexistent within the institutions studied. In contrast, each institution emphasized fellowship, communion with God, brotherly love and compassion. The focus is on education, but within that education "God" is an essential part. As reported by the administrators of the substance abuse programs, the faculty and staff are committed to the students, whom they see as their number one priority.

On all campuses studied the substance administrators deal mainly with the subjective. They operate within what is essentially a closed environment. The emphasis is predominantly on identifying the behavior of the individual, intervening in a way that appeals to the individual's value system and ensuring the actualization of the individual's potential.

That the match of frames is effectively comprehended by the various directors interviewed is apparent, since all displayed an excellent match of director with institution. Some directors made very clear statements emphasizing that they are not employed at the respective institution "for the money", and that if primary emphasis were on making the most money, they would be employed elsewhere. They all placed themselves in the position that they were there for service to the students and that students affected the
operationalization of the institution. There was unanimous concern with a proper student to institution match as well. Students in these private sectarian institutions are the greatest change agents, a situation which is essentially the reverse of the public institution where control is more commonly from the top down, the voting citizen being the change or control agent.

All administrators of the substance abuse programs stated they were well aware of the current environment of economic deprivation, and one administrator regretted that economic constraints made it necessary to justify the existence of the unit in which the program operates. It was their opinion they were all realistic when it came to events within and outside of the unit and organization. Of course, the various institutions were concerned about financial resources, but this concern was mainly expressed as a vehicle with which to obtain the goals and objectives of the institutional mission statement. They were upset about needing personnel to carry on the proper functioning of their units but understood this was a common problem within the entire organization as well as in other organizations because of the current economic situation of dwindling resources. According to the administrators, the political frame was not an acceptable frame to utilize in their view because when a program is based on the "God-fearing" philosophy characteristic of these institutions, they
believe you should not be selfish and ego centered. This is an integral difference between the human resource frame and the political frame, which is a conflict centered system. Conflict is not acceptable in this environment; power and politics are surrendered to God and politics are as unacceptable as conflict in a "God-centered" environment. Negotiating and bargaining do occur, but they are carried out in a Christian context, being used to bond the staff, faculty, and students to the institution. In this regard, the specific type of religious affiliation did not seem to impact on the administrator's use of the four frames in any of the institutions studied. In view of the current economic climate and the stated needs at all but LeTourneau University for additional resources, the organizations could consider utilizing the mechanisms of the political frame in order to be more competitive and effective in future.

Area for Discussion

Lessons for Practice

As reported by the administrators of the substance abuse programs in the selected private sectarian institutions of higher education who participated in this study do a tremendous job in three areas: recruitment of students, selection of students, and management of enrolled students.
Each university or college studied has a strong, concise mission statement which identifies the institution's purpose. This statement is published in the general catalog and in other appropriate documents, including recruitment literature and application forms. These written documents establish from the very beginning a clear message that each of the institutions is an environment which ascribes a high value to the Christian ethic. In effect, these mission statements describe very clearly the model or ideal type of student which the institution is seeking. They send a signal to prospective students that behavior which is congruent with that mission statement and purpose will be required; i.e., students who do not fit the model need not apply. We can divide the mission message into three phases: pre-recruitment, recruitment/orientation and matriculated student status.

Pre-Recruitment:

The most important individual in the pre-recruitment process is the recruiter. At Christian institutions the recruiter's position is a high-status position carrying heavy responsibility. It is the chief job of the recruiter to screen or discriminate from among the applicants and prospective applicants the individuals who will best fit the mission of the institution. To do his job, the recruiter matches the prospective student to a hypothetical "stencil"
which outlines the ideal student. Students who do not match this "stencil" will not be allowed to apply.

There are several steps to the screening process. Before the recruiter hands a student the recruitment package, he conducts an interview to ensure that the student's personal beliefs and value system seems to be in tune with the objectives of the college. It is the responsibility of the recruiter to carry the message that Christian values and behavior are expected. The student with a substance abuse problem will not be allowed to apply. If the student passes this first interview, the recruitment package which contains both printed material and a video tape stressing the purpose and mission of the institution, will be provided, along with a mailer in which to return the video tape. Because of the importance they ascribe to a good student/institutional match, each school expends a larger amount of its admissions budget on the pre-recruitment and recruitment process. At one institution, the administrator faulted the recruitment process when a student had a sub abuse problem, because he felt that recruitment had failed to capture the right student. He made it very clear that the major proportion of effort is expended in going after the right student. Indeed, all the administrators made the point that there is concern for costs in today's economy. They try to maximize their recruitment dollars by targeting only the student who has
the potential to become a true "servant-leader" in the Christian concept. Because it is possible to capture exact costs of recruiting students, and because they know that these costs are high, they feel they cannot afford to lose any students through substance abuse. For that reason, clear communication to the public of the exact type of student they are seeking is vital.

Recruitment/Orientation:

Recruitment begins with the recruitment package, which in most instances includes a video, the catalog and application forms. The institutional mission is stressed in the print material, and the video takes the student on a walk through the institution, upholding the values and the nature of the environment. The application form itself contains a concise version of the mission statement, and the student is required to sign an affidavit that attests to his belief in and support for that mission.

The recruitment package is followed up with letters and phone calls further cultivating the interest of the student and ascertaining his suitability to matriculate at the institution. Additional winnowing occurs during this process. Finally, the student and his family are invited to a pre-enrollment orientation on the campus. It is at this point that student service personnel become involved in the recruitment procedure.
In addition to helping to host the pre-orientation, student services personnel speak to applicants and their families about behavioral expectations and student life. They speak individually with each student and his family during meals, formal and informal sessions, in effect helping conduct a continual interview during which the mission and goals of the institution are further developed and the winnowing process is continued.

The student who makes it to the point of actual matriculation has been through an exhaustive process during which he has convinced everyone involved in recruitment that he has the potential to succeed at the institution. The process does not stop there, however, since the student is put through an additional orientation period immediately following actual registration, again designed to saturate him with the mission and goals of the institution and to accustom him to the expected behavior at that institution.

Matriculated Student Status:

The Christian ethic is part of the educational process from the student’s first day on campus. It not only guides the formal orientation, as described above, but is also a part of daily life. Advisors include it in drawing up degree plans; faculty include it in the classroom; residence life and programming includes it; and it is included in the daily or weekly required chapel attendance, prayer meetings
or fellowship periods. Each institution takes the holistic approach, developing the mind in communion with the soul or spirit and the body. It is important to note; however, that, despite expecting students to follow an extremely rigorous code of ethics, these institutions do not serve "in loco parentis", as explained by Kaplan (1985). One administrator cited the example of parents who objected to what they considered obscene material tacked up in their son's residence hall room. When asked to remove the material, the administrator refused to do so, explaining that this type of dispute would have to be between the student and his parents.

Recruitment As A Tool for Substance Abuse Program Administration

Substance abuse program administrators in private sectarian institutions of higher education reap the benefit of their institutions' strong recruitment procedures and relatively high expenditures on recruitment. The administrators are presented with fewer students who either already have or have the potential to develop a substance abuse problem. Additionally, they can afford to spend less on substance abuse programming than their counterparts in other types of institutions.
With such a pervasive emphasis at each institution on Christian ideology and values, according to the administrators of the substance abuse programs it becomes apparent when a student is having a substance abuse problem and are not walking "in step" with the rest of the community. Whenever the latter occurs, each institution follows a specific protocol (as stated in Chapter IV) for dealing with the problem. Step one is the identification of a problem. This step may be undertaken by a faculty member, a staff member or an administrator. On some campuses, and depending on the severity of the problem, it may immediately be referred to the administrator who handles substance abuse problems. On others, individual staff or faculty efforts may undertake to solve the problem before it is referred. When the problem reaches the administrator, the handling of the case depends in most instances on whether or not the student shows remorse. If he or she appears, in the opinion of the administrator of the substance abuse program, to be remorseful, he or she may be able to stay in the environment with some limitations, such as counseling. If he or she does not show remorse or sorrow for the act against the stated mission of the institution, he or she will be dismissed immediately. [Interventions which are at the disposal of the administrator are delineated under *Demographic Profiles of Substance Abuse Program*]
Administrators - substance abuse responsibility* in Chapter IV.]

**Recommendations for Future Study**

Heretofore there has been little data available about substance abuse programs in small private sectarian institutions of higher education. The organizational dimensions of the substance abuse programs have been framed in this study (see Chapter IV) by utilizing Bolman and Deal's four frames, as explained in Chapter I. Bolman and Deal theorize that the administrator who truly understands his organization will be able to make that organization more effective. Identification of the frames is basic to the next procedure recommended, that of applying quantitative techniques to furnish statistical data about the effect of the substance abuse program among students in these selected private sectarian institutions of higher education. If, as postulated in Chapter I, the organizational dimensions of the administration of the substance abuse programs impact the conduct of the programs and their effectiveness within the institution, then the administrators of the substance abuse programs could select for implementation the management frames which lead to the most effective programs. A study of quantitative data should substantiate effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the administration of the programs.
The researcher also recommends that this study of the organization dimension of the administration of substance abuse programs in small private sectarian institutions of higher education in Texas be used as the basis for two follow-up studies, the first comparing the organization dimensions utilized at these institutions with those utilized at large private sectarian institutions. Two interesting aspects which this study was not designed to pursue but which would be fruitful fields for additional exploration are the impact of size and the impact of strict or lax adherence to the institutional mission on the organizational dimension utilized by administrators of substance abuse programs in larger schools and in schools outside Texas. If the organizational dimensions of substance abuse programs in larger private sectarian higher education institutions in Texas are similar to those identified in this study, then the conclusions of this study may be generalizable to all substance abuse programs in Texas private sectarian institutions; and if to Texas sectarian institutions, then perhaps to all Bible-belt private sectarian institutions of higher education.

Application of the frames theory to public institutions is also recommended, along with a comparison of results of this study with results of a similar study of public institutions of higher education. Such a study would allow
identification of the frames which are most effective for the management of substance abuse programs in any setting.

A third area recommended for future study concerns the effect of length of tenure of the administrators of substance abuse programs. None of the administrators in this study has served for more than five years in his or her current position. The strong opposition to the political frame described in Chapter IV may be a reflection of lack of tenure. It is possible, though not in this researcher's estimation probable, that when these directors have served a longer time and have faced more competition for dwindling resources, their opposition to use of the political frame may diminish. Certainly, additional study of other administrators within the same system could validify the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of their current predominant use of the human resource frame, rather than the political frame.
APPENDIX I

SUBSTANCE ABUSE TIMETABLE

1883
One of the first acts by Congress; tariff on opium used for smoking was raised from $6 to $10 per pound.

1887
Law enacted which prohibited the Chinese from importing opium.

1890
Law enacted allowing only U.S. citizens the right to manufacture opium for smoking and the tariff was increased to $12 per pound (Brecher, 1972).

1906
Pure Food and Drug Act passed (Coca-Cola was the major issue of that time; Coca-Cola ended up removing the cocaine from the coca leaves used to make the drink). This act prohibited the addition of caffeine to any product. (Many soft drinks on the market today contain additives such as caffeine).

1914
Harrison Narcotic Act passed. All coca products were then classified as a narcotic. This act was later modified to exclude the coca leaves that had
the cocaine removed.

1919-1933

Eighteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution ratified. Passage of the Volstead Act to implement the amendment prohibits the manufacture, sale, and transport of alcoholic beverages, but not their consumption. Twenty-first Amendment repeals the Eighteenth.

1953

Public Law 91-612 (P.L. 91-616, 1953) mandated that a single state agency be designated to administer a statewide plan for the prevention, treatment, and control of alcohol addiction and abuse. (Corresponding legislation in the State of Texas, House Bill No.1559, codified as Article 5561c of Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes, created the Texas Commission on Alcoholism.) The commission's purpose was to prevent broken homes and the loss of lives by: (1) coordinating the efforts of all interested and affected state and local agencies, (2) developing educational and prevention programs, and (3) promoting the establishment of effective treatment and rehabilitation programs (Newby, 1979).

1950s-1960s
Statistics correlated the increased heroin addiction and rising crime levels particularly in the inner cities (Office of Drug Abuse Policy, 1978).

1960s-1970s

Recognition of serious drug problems among students as well as servicemen in Vietnam. Widespread rumors about heroin addiction and other hard drug abuse among U.S. servicemen.

mid-1960s

Serious concerns about extensive recreational use of marihuana and other psychoactive drugs (Wexler, 1986).

1966

Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act passed.

1967

Vocational Rehabilitation Act (people with a drug-related problem recognized as disabled).

1970

Epidemic peak of drug use in the United States.

1970

Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs created.

1970

Interagency Drug Abuse Council formed.

1970

Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcohol Prevention,
Treatment and Rehabilitation Act (P.L. '91-616) passed.

1970

1972
Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act.

pre-1973
Few early lessons learned regarding drug education. Curiosity was aroused and curiosity is credited as one of the main reasons for drug experimentation. Often the drug education was reinforcing the curiosity.

1 April 1973
Federal government placed a moratorium on the production of drug material.

4 February 1974
Moratorium lifted - new guidelines established for all federal agencies publishing drug abuse information material.

1976

1976
Office of Drug Abuse Policy was established.
May 1978


1976

Office of Drug Abuse Policy was established.

May 1978

Reorganization Plan #1 of 1977 provision - Office of Drug Abuse Policy was abolished and its responsibilities transferred to the Domestic Policy Staff. This facilitated the integration of drug abuse policy into the mainstream of policy development.

1979

The Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Amendments (P.L. 96-181, 1979) placed in effect to amend the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (Dcgoloff, 1980).

9 May 1979

Executive Order 12133 designated the associate director of drug policy within the Domestic Policy Staff as the individual primarily responsible for the federal government program of drug abuse prevention and control.

1981

Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act fundamentally changed the role that the federal government played in overseeing and funding drug abuse prevention,
treatment, and rehabilitation programs by creating an Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Health Service Block Grant (ADMS Block Grant) designed to distribute the federal money that had previously been provided to the states through formula and project grants and contracts and specified how the states were to spend their allotment.

1982
Department of Defense Authorization Act provided military cooperation with civilian law enforcement officials. It permitted military personnel to operate military equipment that had been lent to civilian drug enforcement agencies.

24 June 1982
Executive Order directed the Office of Policy Development to assist the president in performing his duties under the Drug Abuse Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act. This act designated the director of the Drug Abuse Policy Office within the Office of Policy Development as primarily responsible for coordinating, overseeing, and policymaking for all executive international and domestic drug abuse functions.

1983
Omnibus Crime Bill (H.R. 3963) included a provision to establish an Office of Director of National and
International Drug Operations and Policy. The proposed agency would be charged with the "overall planning and coordination of federal efforts to control the supply of dangerous drugs."

12 October 1984


19 October 1984


1984

Controlled Substance Registrant Protection Act, Bail Reform Act and Comprehensive Forfeiture Act stated that a defendant's ill-gotten profits from racketeering were forfeitable. Dangerous Drug Diversion Control Act.

1985
Financial losses in the U. S. economy owing to substance abuse amount to $50.7 billion.

1986

Drug-Free America program mandated that colleges and universities that accept federal money in any fashion must have an operational substance abuse plan.

1988

Financial losses to the U. S. economy from substance abuse estimated at $143.8 billion.

Congress passed Drug-Free Workplace Act (Public Law 100-690).

1989

Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (P.L. 101-226).

1990

$136.3 Billion spent on substance abuse in the United States.

1992

Surgeon General estimates annual substance abuse-related deaths in the United States to be in excess of 500,000.
APPENDIX II

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Demographic Data

1. Biographical information: date and place of birth, education level, etc.
2. What do you do here (description of work)?
3. What is your job title?
4. What department or unit do you work in?
5. Have you held previous positions in the organization?
6. How long did you work at each position?
7. What task(s) does (do) your unit (group, department, division) perform? What are the main techniques and means used to do these things?
8. With whom do you have to work (inside and outside the organization) to get things done? How do you communicate with them--informal discussions, meetings, telephone, written reports, computer links, and so on?
9. What kinds of problems do you have to handle at work? Describe.
10. When problems occur, how do you handle them?
Describe.

11. What variations and unexpected situations occur in your work?

12. What difficulties or barriers occur in getting the work done here or doing it the way you would like to?

13. How is the work coordinated within the unit? (Probe for the kinds of controls used, e.g., budgets, direct supervision, quality control, periodic evaluations, MBO, etc.)

14. Are goals and objectives spelled out for your unit? If so, how?

15. How do you know when you have done a job well? (Probe for nature of criteria, type of feedback, and time involved in feedback.)

Political

1. What other units do you have to work with to get the work done?

2. How are contacts with other units coordinated?

3. What kinds of things does your unit need to get from other units--funds, approval for action, materials, people, information, and so on--and how do you get these things?

4. Describe relations with other units. Smooth and trouble-free? Uncertainties and problems? (If so, please describe them.)
1. What kinds of contacts does your unit have with external groups or organizations?
2. What markets or fields (areas) does your unit work/compete in?
3. What kinds of things do people in your unit need to know about what is going on outside the organization and how do they find out?
4. What are the main kinds of resources--people, materials, services, funds, and information--you get from these groups?
5. On which groups are you most dependent?
6. Do you run into problems and challenges in obtaining or supplying these resources and in dealing with external groups and conditions? (If so, please describe them and explain how you handle them.)
7. How is the work in this unit organized and how does the unit fit into the whole organization?
   a. Who is the head of the unit?
   b. To whom does the head report?
   c. Who reports to the head?
   d. Describe the organization chart of your unit and organization.
8. What are the main rules or procedures in your
unit that everyone has to follow? How well do they seem to work?

9. What arrangements are there for taking care of people's health, safety, and retirement needs here?

10. What opportunities are there for obtaining additional skills or training while working here?

11. Is there a union here? If so, what is the climate of union-management relations?

12. How involved is the union in issues other than salary and benefits?

13. What other (informal) groups are there besides the official unit? (Probe for work teams, cliques, links between and within departments, groups of employees from similar ethnic backgrounds, and so on.)

Human Resources

1. How do the informal groups you mentioned affect the way the work is done here? Do they get along with one another?

2. Do you feel a part of any of these groups? If so, if you came up with a new idea or worked especially hard, how would the other people in your group(s) react?

3. Who is your supervisor--the person who is
directly responsible for your work?

4. How closely do you work with the supervisor?

5. What is it like to work with him or her?

6. What is it like to work with the other people in your unit? (Probe for behavior indicating quality, nature of interpersonal relations, e.g., chat a lot, versus keep to themselves; help out one another.)

7. How do people find out about what is going on in the unit and in the organization as a whole? (Probe for informal and official communication channels and their use.)

8. How are decisions made in your unit?

9. How much say do you have in decisions affecting your work? To what extent does your supervisor consider your opinions or consult you when making decisions affecting you?

10. Who are the really influential people in your unit?

11. Who really controls what goes on in the organization as a whole?

12. What do you have to do to get ahead around here?

13. What rewards are there for doing your job well? (Probe for kinds of rewards—pay, promotion, praise, feeling of a job well-done,
certificates, "attaboys" and the kinds of behavior which is rewarded in the unit and the organization.)

14. When people within the unit disagree about things, how are these differences resolved (e.g., the boss decides alone, we discuss all the sides of the question until we have the best solution, we compromise, and so on)?

15. In general, how satisfied are you with working here?

16. What things make you feel most satisfied?

17. What are the things with which you are least satisfied?

Symbolic/Cultural

1. What would you say is the overall mission or purpose of your organization, i.e., what does it say it stands for?

2. How does the organization pursue its mission?

3. If you were telling a friend what it was really like to work here, how would you describe the atmosphere at work? (Probe for norms, beliefs about the nature of the work, how it should be done, and employee's involvement in work.)

4. What aspects of work are most emphasized here--quality, costs, speed, quantity, innovation,
etc.?

5. Do you feel comfortable in taking risks or sticking your neck out in your unit? (Probe for support for initiative, risk taking, attitudes toward criticism.)

6. Can you give me an example of one of your unit's major successes or achievements? Describe.

7. Can you give me an example of one of your unit's major failures? Describe.

8. Do you feel that your unit is operating effectively? What do you mean by effective?

9. We have talked a lot about the way things are done today in your unit. Could you tell me something about how they got this way? How have things changed since this unit got started? (Note timing of changes.)

10. What about the organization as a whole, how has it changed?

Follow-Up

1. What do you see as the main challenges that will be facing your unit and your organization during the next two or three years? Do you have any suggestions for how to handle them?

2. What do you feel are the main strengths of your unit?
3. What are the strengths of the organization as a whole?

4. What are the main problems in the unit?

5. What are the main problems in the organization (or division) as a whole?

6. What things seem to be most in need of change in your unit?

7. What things seem to be most in need of change in your organization?

LISTING OF SELECTED UNIVERSITIES

CRISWELL COLLEGE
DALLAS BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
DALLAS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LETOURNEAU UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF DALLAS
The Rationale for the Method

The premise of the following profiles is to provide a basis for understanding the respective substance abuse program directors, their duties and the environments in which they perform those duties. The profiles provide a practical basis for capturing the essence of the experiential situations while focusing on the comprehension of those experiences. It provides the reader with the feel of being a part of the original interview (citations).

Interviews were conducted over a period of several months, beginning with initial contacts via telephone in the fall of 1992, through the actual interviews done in person using the semi-structured interview protocol explained in Chapter 3, and ending with the follow-up interviews, conducted during the spring of 1993. The interviews resulted in approximately 500 pages of typed transcript. The researcher submitted these pages to the respective directors for approval. Each transcript was then read carefully numerous times, and passages pertaining to management issues and research questions were flagged. Passages were then isolated and analyzed in the context of the four frames and classified according to the relevant frame.
The profiles below, which consist of demographic data about each director, were constructed utilizing almost exclusively the original words of each director in order not to transliterate (Ives, 1984; Mitchell, 1985; Harrison, 1987; Siedman, 1991; and Glesner, 1992) while deleting only the obviously insignificant emergent or redundant data (Ives, 1984; Mitchell, 1985; Harrison, 1987; Siedman, 1991; and Glesner, 1992). Bracketed words are the words of the researcher provided to ensure clarity and continuity of meaning for the oratory of the substance abuse program directors (Ives, 1984; Mitchell, 1985; Harrison, 1987; Siedman, 1991; and Glesner, 1992).

Each director gave permission for the use of his or her name and the name of the institution is provided. A written donor agreement (Neuenschwander, 1985) obtained prior to the interview provided for a review of the typed transcript after the interview was completed and an approval signature by the donor.
I was born in Dallas and I attended schools in East Dallas and later moved to Irving where I finished high school. I later attended college at Howard Payne University where I received an Undergraduate Degree and then later, my Masters Degree at Sam Houston State University and then a Doctorate of Education Administration at the University of Houston. I also attended Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. As for my employment, I started out teaching and later moved to the college level. I also served on the church staff as an administrator and two and a half years ago I came to Dallas Baptist University as the registrar and director of student services and a year later became Vice President [of] Student Affairs.

One thing that we try to do here is to develop a community with our students. We try to communicate that the atmosphere on campus is a real family type atmosphere. We do that through trying to involve our faculty and staff with our students outside the classroom and work experience and we do that by having things such as the college adoption program, which our faculty/staff adopt dorm students for the year. We have Spiritual Emphasis Weekend, which our
students go into the homes of faculty and staff. Our students are all in various committees here at the school in which so they're integrated into our structure, so we really try to involve them in the atmosphere of campus life. We are also very interested in retention and we are in the process of and have developed an early alert system to help us identify students that we consider to be at risk academically, emotionally, socially, financially or as far as their goals are concerned, or lack of goals. Once we identify those students then through a meeting of student affairs staff, we can figure out strategies to try to meet their needs; so that's another major thing that we do. Another is we're interested in developing what we call Servant Leaders on campus and we do that by several ways. One is through workshops and conferences and seminars that we might have to focus on leadership skills and development. We have a freshman orientation class that all our freshmen are required to go to for a full year. Servant Leadership is kind of interwoven into that class. We also have students [that] are on, what we call, Christian Leadership Scholarships who attend a one hour class each week of Christian Leadership Class, so we emphasize [the] Servant Leadership concept in that class also.

As far as getting things done, I have a lot of freedom in my area to plan and to organize and to implement various
programs. I typically work with the President of the University. I report directly to him and I try to keep him informed on the direction I am going to make sure I am consistent with other areas on campus then I would typically work with that department head to try to coordinate with them and try to plan with them to try to accomplish a particular goal.

As far as students are concerned, I try to identify with the key student leaders on campus, and if I'm trying to accomplish something on campus to where I feel like the students need to have some ownership with the program or the plan, then I'll involve the student leaders on campus to do that. As far as off campus is concerned, I may have some contact with parents on various kinds of issues, sometimes our board of trustees, that relates to some policy, but typically, I relate more to the inner-workings of the University than I do to the outside.

The kinds of problems, [we] have to handle at work are the people kinds of problems which will be student problems that might relate to discipline kinds of issues and I typically do not get involved in discipline issues unless they are more serious nature - personnel kinds of problems on communication issues or some type of conflict in the office; I will get involved in that. There are times when
there are mechanical kinds of breakdowns on campus in which I have to maybe coordinate several different offices to make sure we are correcting the problem and if we have to make some adjustments, we do that. An example would be we had a pipe burst in the dorm and it flooded one of the wings and so we had to shut the water off, which means communicating with the food services area, maintenance, and all the students on campus, and we had to shift the students to the gym area so they could take showers and get cleaned up, so there's coordination involved in that. But that's kind of a typical kind of problem.

[When problems occur how we handle them] depends on the kind of problem. If it's a problem that involves, what I call, a not very complicated type problem; where it's a mechanical type problem or something that is not of a very serious nature, I typically will just delegate that to a person that's in my area and I'll check back with them to make sure the problem was taken care of. If it's a more complex problem that involves,- maybe we are having to discipline a student which could end up in dismissing the student from school or the dormitory and it could in turn involve several students and possibly parents, then typically I will get involved with the resident life staff, the Dean of Students, and usually what we will do is meet together as a group and I try to gather information; and I
may have students come in and we typically will work up a strategy of how we are going to address the problem and how we are going to solve the problem.

[Variations and unexpected situations that occur in work are] unexpected situations [that] are typically the student kinds of discipline problems, in which the student has done something or has been alleged to have done something. It may the night before; if you come in with your whole agenda planned for the day, you have to put that to side to address the problem, typically if it's a real serious nature. So those kinds of problems are the unexpected ones and then of course the mechanical kinds of problems in which things break, the telephone goes down or something with the electrical or whatever; a line gets cut. So we have to address those kinds of issues coordinate with the different offices....computer failures. We’ve had that happen some.

I’d say our greatest barrier, although it’s not a negative thing, I feel like I have the resources to accomplish the goals that I set, although we would like to have more people resources as well as financial resources. I feel like we could do even more and there were times when we were limited somewhat because of that. So I would say that is the main one. I think that is pretty well it as far
as limiting factors. I do have a lot of freedom and planning and organizing and setting goals for my area and there is a lot of freedom in that.

Each of our areas have goals that they set. They each have department heads that meet with their staff and they plan. I ask for goals on a regular basis from each of the department areas to make sure that they are thinking ahead, looking ahead. We have a planning retreat with student affairs staff once a year in which we coordinate all of our areas and do calendar planning and visionary kind of planning. We'll take a look at some concepts and see if we can't break that down so it can be used for real practical terms on campus. We ask ourselves "Is there more effective ways to do what we are doing?" So it is pretty comprehensive planning retreatment that we do. We do some things prior to that to get ready for the retreat. Typically we will send them information or I'll send them questions to get them to start thinking about various things. We also meet together, for what we call a student affair staff meeting, but it's really a meeting to discuss how to help students, but in that we have training and we talk about planning and that type of thing. All of our staff have job descriptions, but I really try to work with the department heads and I try to give them freedom to lead their staff and if there is an issue that may occur in that
area, I try to work with them to help them identify what the problem is and help them come up with some solutions. I try to work through them to solve the problems of their area.

We don’t have formalized evaluations process. My philosophy is, I try to work very closely with our department heads that are in the student affairs area. I pretty well know what the issues are and if we do have a problem that occurs, I’ll address the problem and I will discuss it with the person and we’ll talk through it and if it involves a personnel matter that is of serious nature, we’ll try to come up with a plan to improve with a timeline and if that is not addressed then we go ahead and let people go in the student affairs area. That can happen and it has happened. I try to use it as a last resort type of thing. We go through a process before it gets to that point.

Right now I’m in the process of moving to implementing some Total Quality Management aspects into what we do here. I’ve been reading quite a bit the last few months about Total Quality Management. We have a person who’s on our staff at the University who has a good background in that area and had good schools at Xerox. My goal is to take part of those concepts or most of those concepts and implement into the student affairs staff as far as how we do things here. I will be using that. We do set goals. I try to
hold accountable in a caring way. My philosophy is, I want our staff to work hard, but I want them to enjoy what they're doing and so I want this to be a fun place to be too. I think our staff would tell you that there are high expectations, but it's also a pleasant, fulfilling place to work. Also my students would say that.

We are not highly formalized like may be a business would be, although I do ask each of the department heads to set goals for the year with objectives and we'll evaluate those throughout the year. My goal is, as we continue to become more effective as a division, that we'll be having TQM principles integrated into our division. I brought up earlier this issue of servant leadership. I think in the area of business we'll begin to see literature that is written that talks about leaders who are servants and the customer service mentality, and putting people first. Those kinds of things are the kinds of things that are important to me and I think is in the concept of the servant leader is all part of that. I would see us within our staff trying to develop a process to develop servant leaders so our staff can also be role models for our students who are also try to build as servant leaders. I see that all integrating together eventually. It's going to take some time to get to
that point.

[When I know when you have done a job well is a] tough question. I think from beginning to [the] end if I have.... it’s a kind of problem or task which involves people; they felt ownership in planning and accomplishing the task, they’ve felt good about what they have done. I have not done it for them, but I worked with them and through them to accomplish something. I feel as good about that as I do about accomplishing a task. I think that’s really rewarding. If it’s helped us help people then, I feel good about that too. If what we are doing, we get to the ultimate end then we can say "that by doing this, this is what happened," then I feel very good about that. An example would be, there are some things that we do on campus that the students are involved in and planning as well as implementing the event. I feel I could just say "We’re going to do this for you," and I could do an excellent job. We would have it all lined out. It would be a timeline and people would be accountable and that type of thing. But, I would accomplish the overall goal as far as we’d be doing that for the students instead of students doing it for themselves. The students may do it and it’s not going to be as polished, they are going to make mistakes. They aren’t
going to know the right questions to ask, but through the process they’re going to learn things and to me that’s a better goal than us entertaining the students. On some things, I might be looking for excellence. On other things, they might not need to be so excellent. There maybe a bigger goal than excellence. We do encourage the students to move towards excellence and do the best that they can, but also recognize that there is a level of maturity that they haven’t reached yet and so it’s going to be a growing process for that. So, those same things, I guess that would help me know that I’ve been affective, I guess in accomplishing certain things.

The President is real good about [giving feedback]. He’ll send me a note and will say “That was a wonderful program,” or “That’s a great idea.” He does that a lot.

I get it from students that they have been touched. They may not tell me directly, but I may have heard from such and such that lately a faculty member has touched them. The faculty member is involved in a problem that we developed. To me that’s really rewarding that it helped that way. They didn’t necessarily tell me, but I knew that we planned and
that was my intention.

[It comes back to me] possibly through hearsay or [I] just might hear the student say something. The faculty member may call and say "I had so and so come to me today and said this." It could be just the informal communication that occurs on campus. There may be times when I get a note from a student or staff member that would be a note of appreciation. So, I think that's a way that I hear things. Our President gives us a lot of freedom in our area. He's not one to make a whole list of goals and objectives and he's not going to be there to check them all off once a week ... and you know he's not going to hammer us about those. He does expect excellence and he's got a lot of confidence in us. He also gives us a lot of freedom in our area.

We work with [admissions] as far as the kinds of students we are wanting to reach here. I think one of the things as far as retention is concerned is to make sure that we are getting a good student institution fit. There are some students that just aren't going to fit here and we want to make sure that we are communicating to the Admissions Staff, "Hey this student isn't working out here and here are the reasons
why..." That helps them when they are targeting the kind of student they're recruiting. Also, that would relate academically too. If we recruit students and half of them are on academic probation when they come...That's not the case here. I am just saying if that happened then that makes our job more difficult as far as retention is concerned. So we work with Admissions to help them understand the complexity with retention and that we want to try to recruit students that will have a chance of making it academically as well as they help identify the students before they get here; the students that are potentially at risk and so we can, before the person even gets here, we can develop strategies to meet their needs or to help them in the process. If it involves faculty, I typically would possibly work with the faculty counsel chairman who may be various different committees on campus that I would work with. A lot of times though, it's just with individual faculty members to identify faculty who I would consider to be not just excellent to, but also are interested in caring for the students outside of the classroom and I'll target them to help us with retention kinds of issues because I know that they are interested in that.

I pretty well have trouble free relations with
most divisions on campus. Sometimes it could be, that because of lack of people resources, we don’t get things as quickly as we would like or it might even be financial. Lack of financial resources may be; we’re not able to do what we thought we could do and so we have to kind of change our plans a bit. So that would be some difficulties that could occur. But, I would say overall, we do have a good working relationship. It’s more when we have disagreements and conflicts that we are able to sit down and talk for a little, I think; and work things out.

We don’t really have a whole lot of contact with external groups. I do have some contact with the parents. Usually it relates to that their student is in trouble academically and they are wanting to get some help or they have questions about financial aid and they want us to help with that. It could be certain kinds of problems that the student is facing. May be I’ll agree with certain rules that we have here or lack of rules that we might have. So, I guess the parents would be an external group that I relate to. The Board of Trustees is a group that I don’t see everyday, but we meet three times a year. It’s a policy making body of the University. I have a student services committee that I meet with and we meet for an
hour each time that we come and usually give them feedback as to what is going on and what we are planning and the kinds of things that we are doing. I have students come in and talk about the various things that are occurring on campus. There will be some businesses relating in student services that relate to such as our telephone service contract that we might have or our vending machine contracts, post office. We deal with any type of publications. We have some publication companies, we deal with all student activities and internal publications and those kinds of things.

[A problem of competition] as far as our campus is concerned? I don't know that there would be what you call competition. I guess to some degree when you have limited financial resources there may be some negotiating going on. I'm not really involved much in any kind negotiating. I've turned in a budget and I pretty well get that approved for the most part and if it's not then it's explained why and it's defined. So there is not much competition, I would say. We're not really competing with anybody. I don't see that much on campus.

One of the things I do to try to help us stay
informed as far as our campus life is that I get all the student newspapers from North Texas, UTA, TCU, some of the small Baptist colleges in Texas as well as a school in Arkansas. I try to stay on top, as far as issues on other college campuses. If there is a particular article that relates to some issues that are occurring here then I will copy that and send it to the various staff to inform them of what is going on. Also, they might get ideas from other campuses as far as how they are addressing various problems or may be I might identify a problem that we haven’t dealt with and they’ll try to address it. So that’s one way to stay on top of what’s out in the public. In the area of leadership, I’ll read books or articles and I’ll send them out to the various people that I think it will be most helpful. We talk about different concepts in the meeting we’re in. We talk about another thing; I try to stay in touch with as well as the other staff members do, is relating to students and the issues and what they are reading. The Chronicle of Higher Education prints out a "Top Ten List" of books students are reading these days and I try to read some of those books and I try to stay in touch and what they are thinking. I try to identify the needs of students today, what are their fears and what are the issues of today. I try to identify what kind of students are we
getting today, what kind of home environment are they coming from. That's one the things I done a great deal of reading in the last few years is in the area of dysfunctional family systems. I guess I'm trying to understand the core issues of our students when they come here so we can better meet their needs so when they react a certain way we can better understand the core of issue behind their reaction. It's not so much that I call a meeting and say "We're going to talk about this issue," but we try to integrate that into our meetings. We may talk about family system or a particular student who has a parent that is alcoholic and how can we help that student.

Information, ideas, training, can help us better understand our situation. I even think talking with parents who are external, you'll learn more about the student and understand them better.

I'm most dependent on the staff I work with. I really take a team approach. I think we're all gifted and take different perspectives. I see things one way and they see it another. We get together and talk through it and look at all the different angles on it then we can come up with a plan. I'm real dependent on the staff and try to listen to them. I have got key
staff members that I talk to everyday and these are the ones that I consider to be close to the students. They meet with them everyday and are involved with their lives and these are the ones I try to talk to them everyday so I am aware of what is going on. I realize that there are some students who drop by, but a lot of times they are intimidated by the Vice President title so I do try to stay in touch with the students so I do go to the cafeteria and eat. I’ll run with the students so I’m very dependent on the student also as far as what’s going on in their lives. Externally, I’m really not....I guess our Trustees, I’m dependent on them as far as policies. If they didn’t like what was going on it could be some real problems. To some degree the parents. Sometimes they think we’re going to be their parent and I try to tell them that we’re not their parents. We try to have a controlled environment to a degree where a student can have the freedom to make decisions and sometimes they fail, but they can overcome that. There is some accountability and there are some rules here that are not at other schools such as state schools where there may be more freedom. I think that sometimes parents get confused that they want us to be their parent. I got a call from a parent because they were concerned that their son had pictures of female models on their wall. My
response was "Go tell him to take it down," but they wanted me to tell him to do that. I basically said that "I'm not their parent you do not approve of that kind of thing then you need to take that up with your son." As long as they are not violating any school rules then it isn't an issue. For them it was, but they were not willing to work with their son.

I cannot think of any situation where I run into problems. May be sometime with the parent I don't think I'm getting the whole story.

I am the head of the department. I relate directly to the President. I see the Student Affairs as an important aspect of the University and we're enhancing the act of the experience of the student and we're taking that on step further from the classroom to develop leaders. We're trying to build a community not just within our students, but also integrating our faculty staff and students outside the classroom or work experience. Mainly my area involves the campus life, things that happen outside the classroom. As well as things that occur in the classroom, if we can identify at-risk students then we're going to improve their academic experience. We feel like the student is lacking in their social skills because they are without
that support group that they had in High School we try to help them to identify a support group on campus. So if we help them do that then we're helping them academically also. This is also true with emotional problems and if they are worried with their finances this will help them too. I say that this is kind of a system in helping their academic experiences here. I'm not sure that every area has logic to it. There are some issues for example at the Registrars Office and the Student Affairs Office, I would say that is not very typical, there are other kinds of issues that give reason for being in my area.

I think we are all striving for excellence. Although we're doing that it's not a high stressed organization that we are also enjoying it, we're also having fun. We can also make mistakes and learn from them. We're all leaning towards excellence. We're trying to be the best that we can. I try to help the staff with a balanced life; that work is not the only thing there is to living. A lot of times particularly people over student activities have odd hours and they work weekends and I will just tell our director not to come in tomorrow. You know they worked all day Saturday and I don't expect them to work Monday through Friday with those kinds of hours so I try to work with
them. We're not going to solve all the problems today, but we're going to solve some of them and be a better group than we were the day before.

We have a lot of committee structures on campus. That could be like the curriculum committee may have a staff member, faculty, and even a student involved in it. We have a food service committee that has faculty, staff and students. It could be a particular task like we're trying a new computer system for the University. We've got administrators, staff and some members of the faculty on that committee to evaluate all the different computer systems that are out there. Those kinds of things are committees that are already established that go across various departments to perform tasks that we're working on. Informal groups, there probably are some, but I'm a little bit out of touch because I don't work out of any kind of office, but I know that in the Registrar there are groups that kind of hung together and went to lunch together so I know that it occurs, but I'm not really in touch with that because I mainly work with department heads.

I cannot speak for the faculty because I'm not involved with the faculty, but from the staff side, we've got a family type deal that we try to work.
Obviously there are conflicts that arise and we try to work through them. I think that the informal groups help because there is a sense of friendship that's developed. One thing that we have started this year that has helped with our informal groups is that we have a wellness program where the faculty and staff work out in the mornings together and in the afternoon. I've noticed people working out, running together, doing aerobic type exercises and I never saw that before so I think that's helping our informal groups.

I think I'm in an informal group. I work with the Vice President of Advancement, the Director of Admissions. We go to lunch together, we workout together. To some degree we work together, but it's not occurring everyday expect when we go to workout together. We'll talk about problems that are occurring. Sometimes the Vice President will come down and we'll talk about it and he'll say "What do you think?" I'll do the same. If I came up with a new idea, I think that they would be real positive. We bounce ideas with one another to test ideas and get some other thoughts on how to implement the idea.

I talk to them on a daily basis. I also initiated a time when we workout together once a week. I did
this because our time schedules are so busy and we have a different agenda. We don’t have a lot of time to talk so I use that time to about issues that are going on and the future and what’s going on in our life. It helps me build a relationship with him and it also helps me to understand his vision and what’s important to him and what’s important me.

[The President] strives for excellence. He’s a different thinker than I am. I’m more analytical and a planner and go by the system. He’s more intuitive event oriented kind of thinker and has a lot of...how he has a gut feeling about a person and later I’ll find out that he was right. He can pick up certain ques. I have to accept the way that he can understand, that he does not think the way that I do and adjust to that. He gives me a lot of freedom as far as planning and setting goals in my area and he gives me a lot of confidence. He is a real encourager. He does strive for excellence and I think we all pick up on that.

I basically have several different aspects. I have a group that really cares for the students and works with them everyday. I really like working with them. We work well together as a team and we plan and we have the same values and are going the same
direction. We try to figure out ways together to help the students and to do programs and it's a real team effort. I've got other groups on campus that I don't necessary meet them as a team, but I meet them individually and as a staff and we'll do things like putting up security signs on campus. I don't enjoy that as much. We get things done. I'm more excited about working with people to help other people. I get satisfaction out of that. I think there is openness to be who they are, they express their gifts. If they are struggling with something, I hope they feel ok to come talk to me. They visit a lot. They eat together. They work well with each other; help out with activities that involves several offices. If it's a dorm activity it could involve the resident life area, the student activities as well as the BSU Director. Some of the events that we plan on campus like weeks like this week we call Focus week where we focus on an issue. We'll use the BSU and work with that person. We'll use the Director of Internal Communication Counselor to put out publicity. We'll use the dorm to help us with the publicity and the dorm staff. We use the Student Activities to help us plan events or activities around campus. I think there is a good feel as far as that they encourage one another and try to talk to one another.
As far as our unit is concerned, we have a Student Activities Newsletter that goes out in which all the different groups publicize their event in that. I send out to the student affair staff a newsletter which is a real simple kind of thing that the departments send in as far as what’s going on in an office; if someone got a new staff member; had a new child; got married; got an article published; went to a conference; something good happened in a person's life. I did that again to try to build this community feel and that we're a team, that we are not working in isolation with one another. So they find out more about each other in that process too. We do birthday parties for all the staff and usually it's done by each of the offices. Actually the President's Office initiated that. He sends a birthday list to all the department heads and sometimes he calls and says "Is so and so having a birthday party?" So, there are a lot of birthday parties that are going on around. Again, there is a certain benefit to that going on around campus. I'm sure that they get a lot from word-of-mouth. I've noticed that we communicate from E-Mail, Electronic Mail on campus and I notice the folks who send information through computer. They'll say "so and so's birthday is today, you might want to wish them a happy birthday," or "We're having an anniversary party on campus," or "Don't forget the
activity tonight" and that kind of thing. No one
innitiated that, someone just thought to do that on
campus.

[If there is a problem and it is] a simple kind of
problem that involves that particular department, I
pretty well leave that to that department head and it
could be scheduling or whatever that they are involved
in. As far as, planning and looking to the future....
as far as, where we want to go with the department,
I'm involved with the department head on that. We'll
talk through certain goals. "This is what I would like
to see happen. What are some of the things you would
like to see happen in your area? How are we going to
do that?" Those kinds of decisions are made in
meetings. Any complex kinds of issues again are
involved in meetings and planning meets and may be
several meetings are involved to reduce a conflict that
we were involved in.

[The president] talks with me [if there is a
problem]. If it's coming from the President into my
area, he'll call me and say that "We've got this type of
problem. What do you think." He has real strong
opinions and sometimes he'll approach it. If I'm
disagreeing with him, then I'll tell him in a kind way,
"This is how I see it...". Yet, if he still feels strong, if he still wants to do something then I'll support him on that. I'll voice my opinion and perspective behind the doors that would lead us to be united and I try to follow that.

[The] folks that are in [daily] contact with the students on a daily basis would be the BSU Director, the Student Activities Director, Resident Life Directors and then there is Resident Directors. To some degree our Student Development Director teaches a couple of classes with them, but he’s not really there everyday, but he has some influence on new students. I think those are primarily the crucial ones. The others are crucial, but I try to stay in touch with the needs of the student. Obviously, the Registrar is very crucial, but they don’t have to necessarily know how the students feel about certain things. They need to know the policies and the academic policies and they have to make sure that the grades are kept up, but that office is not necessarily in touch with our students on a daily basis.

Our President; he’s a quiet, strong leader. I think he has a definite picture of where we are going. I see my role as helping to articulate that. Again,
he's a different thinker than I am. I think he is more visionary and sometimes it's not that easy to articulate. I try to help. He envisions a good Servant Leader and we talk a lot about that. As far as breaking that down these are aspects of Servant Leadership, he's not the one to do that. I would be the one to do that in my area and we are in the process of doing that now.

[For promotion] I think you have to be confident. I think you have to share the vision of this field. I think you have to figure out how to be tactful and how to disagree and not come across as attacking, but when you disagree that you're treating people with dignity and respect, I think that is important.

I think there are internal rewards knowing that you've helped to accomplish a task or that you've helped people with various things. I've been rewarded by just staff position, being promoted. I think that's true in other places on campus: Vice President of Advancement, Director of Admissions, Director of Residence Life. I think those three are significant because they are competent and share a vision for the school. They're true to people and treat them with respect. We have some folks that are competent and
share vision skills, but they may not necessarily treat
with dignity. I send a lot of notes to people and the
President does this too. He sends notes to people on a
job well done. I’ve done that too. Sometimes I don’t
do that on a consistent basis, but I try to fill that
philosophy over the years; to send somebody a note or
may be I’ll just tell somebody that they are doing a
good job. I might do that to students and staff. I
think that’s helped. We don’t give certificates. I
think they give a party or something for somebody who
has been here for ten years or fifteen years or
something.

If there are some problems in my area then, I meet
with that person and I say "Here’s the issue. Let’s
talk through it and see if we can come up with a
solution." If it’s between two people, I may have both
of them. If it’s a subordinate problem, like my
department head; I listen to what they have to say, but
I have confidence in the department head and I know the
situation, then I’ll probably lean more to the
department head. I try to work with that person to get
the conflict resolved.

I’m very satisfied [here]. I feel like this is a
place where I can use my gifts and I [have] the freedom
Taking a mess and making sense out of it is one thing. Basically to work with other people to solve a problem and come up with some solutions [is another]. Also, to develop programs that are going to help people, particularly students. I'm basically an organized person, but I enjoy doing a task in which people are involved. I don’t enjoy putting together a policy handbook or something. I would much rather work with people in organizing a timeline and people are accountable at certain times where people are accomplishing a goal.

I don’t enjoy some of the mundane kinds of things, which is true of all jobs I guess. You know, paperwork. I don’t enjoy working with students who need help, but aren’t showing much appreciation. I don’t understand that; I struggle with that. I take those kinds of things personally. The main thing to me are the growing leaders on campus, so that’s what I enjoy most. I enjoy dealing with these other problems which could be a discipline problem although I take that there are consequences, but there is also a redemptive process and hopefully that person is going to learn something. That is still leaning towards the
developing leaders on campus and giving them a second chance, but I don't enjoy when I am working with a student and they aren't up front; [when] they're real judgmental.

We are here to integrate our faith into the learning process to where our students see that our faith means something in what we learn, as far as Math, Literature, History or whatever. It's not that we don't learn History. We're going to go to any department and talk about our faith. I see that as our over all mission of the University to do that. That makes us distinctive from other kinds of schools. As far as Student Affairs is concerned, I really see us as developing Servant Leaders. I see that all through out the University, but in Student Affairs, we're in the process of molding and helping the students understand what it means to be a Servant Leader and how to become one. That may be understanding their gifts and how to use them and meet people that are opened to learning and identifying issues in our life that we struggle with, our weaknesses. They could be family of origin issues or relationship issues or whatever.

As far as Student Affairs is concerned, I think we look at our mission and goal and try to look at the
things we are doing and how we are doing them to see how we are accomplishing that goal. I would say that two years ago, we did not have a whole lot going on with the Director of Student Activities. It was like; plan something, have something going on, create some atmosphere on campus. That was her immediate goal. A lot of stuff she did, she did for the students, but now we are moving into a different level, we have things going on. So now we start the honorship over to the students. Our ultimate is not to entertain the students, but to turn those students into leaders. We need the students involved in the planning and implementation in what we are doing. That’s another level that we are trying to reach. We have programs, things that we do, train. We talk a good deal about customer service and the students entering and try to get into the position of the Freshmen when they first get here. We might be saying too much because we have not been here for a long time.

There is a commitment to excellence [here]. With the resources that we have, we are really trying to do things in a first class way, all the way from our printing to our programming and those kinds of things. I think that’s important. It causes a lot of grief, getting to that point. Things are proofed and
reproofed and reproofed. It takes weeks and weeks before it's complete. To do the different kinds of printing that we do it really takes a lot of work and there are a lot of people involved in the process, but to me that is excellence and that is what we're trying to do; build a system to make sure that happens. There is freedom to do our jobs. I feel there is freedom to do goal setting and planning and do think that I have thought of anything that they said that I could not do. It's great. Obviously, since we are a Christian university, it's very important to who we are. We treat people with dignity and respect. We care for people and give people a second chance. We're aggressive in trying to figure out ways to help people, particularly the students. We are not perfect. We make mistakes on a daily basis and try to learn from those mistakes. If a student came here and made a mistake, maybe they violated an alcohol policy, they come in and we address the problem. If I see that the student really feels remorse, then we are going to use that process as a way for him to learn from that experience. The easy thing would be just to suspend them from school. The caring thing to do is if they get to a place where they want to develop or change then we give them a way to do that. Now to have students be more serious, typically it's the attitude
of no remorse, I'm typically tougher with that. The reason is that if I am tougher then may be they will get to a place where they can see that they were wrong and they may change.

Quality is the key thing [here]. Particularly with printed kinds of things. We're in charge of the catalogues, we all do that; handbook, graduate catalogue. So those kinds of things as far as quality is important. Meeting deadlines are important, but quality; we can't meet a deadline if our quality is going to be low. I think harmony, working well with each other, getting along, trying to work as a team is an important aspect.

I take calculated risks. Usually if it is something innovative that I want to do them I'll take the idea and bounce it off some people, may be my informal group that I workout with or various staff. We try to put something together and then I take it to the President and I ask him how he feels. He sees the total spectrum and he may say "not right now," or "that's a great idea. Go with it," or "may be next semester would be a better time." I probably struggle with criticism in that I want to do a good job and that I probably put too much on what I do and who I am.
That’s an area that I am working on to try to let go of that. That’s probably more of an issue in my past than now, but I still have to not take things in a personal way. I have to try to understand dysfunctional families and how family systems work and different roles that they play. I feel like that I am more open to criticism and it is more enjoyable. I would rather know if something is wrong rather than someone just not tell me so I can learn from that.

We are in the process [here at DBU] of developing an early alarm system for students at risk and we are developing a survey that helps us identify with the Admission staff to help us identify with the students. We are in the process of developing ministry teams or care teams to figure out what it is to help students. I get a lot of enjoyment out of all of this. It is really innovative and we get a lot of freedom to do this. It doesn’t take a lot of financial resources to do what we are doing so there aren’t a lot of limitations. Plus, it gives a lot of purpose to what we are doing and it’s a real team builder with our staff because I’ve got a lot of staff in different divisions and we are working together to accomplish a common goal. That is one thing that I enjoy doing now. Any time that we have to fire a staff member, I would
say that's a failure. I really struggle with that. Usually it's after some time of several meetings, working on a plan, that we try to get their place. I feel a sense of failure in that situation. I feel as though I have failed to a certain degree, but again I cannot be responsible for that person and their attitudes. Sometimes I wonder if we could have done something different to help the person or did we hurt the person in some way? I would say those are things that are very difficult.

It's going to take some time to get where I want to be, but I think we are pulling together as a team. I think we are pulling more together as we are able to implement some of the TQM concepts and I've developed some work teams to identify how we are going to implement that and that would be some of the front line staff. I think that will help the morale and the team building concept. I think the concept of identifying at-risk students have helped us pull for a more common goal. I think we are making progress. We are more efficient in how we have done some things and how's a person become and moved to the school and how do they get into the dorm and those kinds of things. We're trying to analyze those things and if the way we have always done things the most affective way to do things.
Sometimes we can do that up front by just looking at it and other times it's a result of a problem that forces us to look at our procedures. Affective, what does that mean? I think it means that we are reaching a goal as a team and the objective is to accomplish the goal, but it is also that people grow and mature and strengthen them. I think to be involved in the process, it gives us some ownership in what we are doing.

Part of the reason that I have the unit that I have now depends on the President. At one time the Student Affairs area was not pulled together. I am the first Vice President that they have had in a long time. By doing that, it combines several offices under our division. I think that was the key thing that brought the group together. The next step was to come up with a common vision of where we are heading. That was July of 1990.

Actually, there has been some changing around. Admissions used to be in my area. The Vice President of University of Advancement was the Director of Admissions so we didn't want to take that away from him completely because he was so involved in building that office. We did not want to take that from under his
umbrella. We have done that with other areas too. Our organizational chart has been changed quite a bit and probably will continue as our needs change and as we get other personnel.

The key thing [here] is retention for us. I think it is a more complex issue. It’s not like that if I do “a” and “b” then this is going to happen. It is more like that if I do these ten things then a certain thing will happen. I think we are trying to identify what are the issues. The biggest issue is, now we know this information, what are we going to do about it. That’s what I communicate to the staff that I’m more interested this year in building a system of how to take care of people rather than helping the people. We will help people this year, but if we don’t have a system then we are going to miss a lot of people. I see this whole year of designing a system to take care of people. If one group fails then there is another group to take care of the student. It will really help our campus life because our students are going to be more satisfied with what is going on and feel like they are being cared for. It’s going to help our recruiting because it costs a lot more money to recruit someone than to keep them. We are going to be closing the back door. We are going to be setting some goals. Right
now our retention rate is at a certain point and we're going to set a five year goal. Each year this is where we want to be.

I have people that have really good people skills, that really care for people, that want to do a good job, who are competent. They have a lot of energy and have a lot of patience with people. They don't see the students where they are now that they will be here five or ten years from now. I think our group treats each other very well. I know there are disagreements, but I think that they respect one another.

We have gotten rid of the attitude that DBU was barely in existence. Before our indebtedness was so great that when you talked about DBU you talked about how much they owed somebody. It's all been paid off. We have a new building, four and a half million dollar building, that is the Student Center which I think communicates something that was the first building we've built in years. There's a sense of excitement that we are accomplishing something and that we are trying to be an affective school. We have higher academic standards, some have actually been denied. We're improving our Graduate programs. Our academic area is steadily improving. I think we are trying to
recruit more traditional students.

Lack of financial resources puts a limit on what we do. I think we have a lack of tradition on campus being a relatively new school. Limited campus life like Student Organization. We just don’t have very many. Until this past year we are trying to develop more to have places where students can fit in. We need more dorms obviously because we need more money. It takes a year and a half to build a dorm and so we are going to need funds available to get more students.

I would say [it’s a] lack of funds that keeps us from doing things that we want to do. Leaning away from us being just a commuter campus to a residential type campus. There is a down side to being in the DFW area where we all are driving in and driving out. It takes me thirty minutes to get here and I typically won’t come back if there is an activity that evening. The fact that the staff isn’t there is a down side.

[Some areas that need improvement or change might be] Freshman Orientation; I see the [instructors] being more theoretical in their teaching and I think that where the students are, it’s more practical and think that they are trying to learn how to survive. It may
seem small, but to me it's crucial because the first
six weeks is when the student decides if he is going to
stay or not. That area is crucial that they have
immediate contact with those students. I would like to
see more changes in that area and I think that has
already started. I want to see TQM implemented in how
we do things. I am using this year as a personal goal
to understand what TQM is and build more jobs. Also,
to work with some people on implementing it here and
use it next year.

Personally, I would say that we need to produce
the type of student we are going after, say, a
traditional age student. We need to do more things to
look like a traditional age campus instead of a
commuter campus. That goes all the way to how our
parking lots look to the scheduling of classes. I
would like to see athletic programs. Not so much
scholarship sports, but more student athletes and try
to increase those because it's a hook when recruiting
students and to get them to stay here. I mentioned
more dorms.
My birthday is February 16, 1955, makes me 37. I was born in Bryan, Texas, makes me Texan. My educational background: Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from Texas A&M University 1977; Masters of Science in Industrial "Psych", same institution in 1981. A Doctorate in the Counseling of Student Personnel Field from Oklahoma State University in--what does it say up there, 1986. I've been basically in the student services field for going on--it's 13 years now.

My official title is the Assistant Dean of Students for Residential Life and Student Development in the Office of Student Life. Since we're a small school, we have a small staff; so we are very much generalists in everything we do. The areas, the principle areas, under my responsibility, that I have direct administration over are: residential life, counseling, the student life portion of new student orientation, our substance education program. Then, I have what you might say, contributory responsibility, in programming our health services, principally. Then, as typical, other duties as assigned -- anything that just comes up, we all just kind of pitch in.
This is my fifth year [here]. [I have been working in this position since] 1988. We provide basically just about everything that happens outside of the classroom. We are a fairly traditional student services program at a small school. In addition to the areas that I mentioned, that come under my responsibility, other services that come out of student life are: student activities and programs, career development, health services, the management and administration of the university center, athletic sports and recreation, and judicial affairs, of course. Those are our principle areas. In terms of what we actually do, we basically strive to complement the academic program by supporting the academic mission of the university, by providing the students an opportunity for an holistic development as college students: physical, social, emotional, -- the whole nine yards; and to do everything we can do, outside of the classroom to contribute to their growth and development as responsible citizens of their community and their society; doing so within the university's mission as a Catholic university and a university that is committed to the western liberal arts education.

We work one-on-one with the students because it is a small place, a small student population. We have an advantage in that we get to know the students pretty well as individuals. So, we do that through ongoing contact with the
students, individually and in groups. We do it through the programming that is offered through our residence halls, through our programming board, which is student-run. We do it through our various student organizations. We do it through the services, that would be one of our health services: counseling, recreation, areas like that. We try to provide students opportunities to experience the greater Dallas area. Since we are small and rather isolated, we try to provide students opportunities to experience the cultural community of Dallas, something of the ethnic community of Dallas, to just really kind of broaden their horizons as much as possible. A lot of that includes one-on-one personal contact, programming and then, ongoing services.

The primary constituents, of course, would be the students and that's where I would say the vast majority of the contact centers. Within, and when you say the organization, do you mean just student life or do you mean the university? Beyond the students, certainly my colleagues in student life. We are always dabbling in each others areas, supporting each other; with our faculty, other staff and administration. Outside, in the external community to the university, depending on the need, we have been in contact and have worked in a cooperative relationship with major corporations in the area, with government agencies, with the medical community, Within
medical, both in terms of physical health physicians but
also with psychiatrists, with psychologists and members of
the mental health profession, with the entertainment
areas,-- just a little bit of everybody. Who we work with
depends on what we are trying to do.

With the students, again a lot of it is personal, just
having a conversation because we see them so much. A lot of
use is made through written communications: memos, letters,
that sort of thing; both in terms of being able to get
information to them, but also to have documentation as a
reminder. The same thing with colleagues, faculty and staff.
A lot is 'phone work. You just pick up the 'phone and you
call people, around here. It's sort of standard. There is
quite a bit that does get done in committee structure. The
university is currently involved in its accreditation
process so, there is a lot of committee work going on. There
is a lot-- a lot that happens very informally. You run into
each other over lunch in the cafeteria-- that sort of thing.

With the external constituencies, certainly we use written
communication: the mails'; phone calls, fax, the standard
business communications. Some of our programs, particularly
our career development, for example, has extensive contact
through site visits, through scheduled meetings with
community groups and corporate headquarters. So, we are
probably not unique in that way, We are probably pretty
standard in our communication strategies. A lot of it is done in a semi-formal infrastructure.

[The kind of problems we handle is] a little bit of everything. Student distress, certainly, and that could be anything from the counseling kind of issues involving student distress, to complaints; or to "Why don't we have such and such?" "Why can't we do this?" Kind of both soothing over some rough waters as well as saying, "Well, you know, that's a good idea. Let's see how we can make that happen." Because they do have responsibilities, to the residential life staff, to the residential programming—a lot of the kind of issues that we feel are staff issues. How do they handle such situations in the home? How do they accomplish the programming that they know how to do? Everything from cutting through red tape to helping find what they need. Dealing with some of the financial aspects of it—that sort of thing. A lot of it is—it varies from day to day, quite honestly. Some of the biggest dilemmas we run into—is there simply doesn't seem to be enough time in the day to get done. And very typically, I mean, I purposely got a big sachel because I am taking work home almost every night. It doesn't get all done during the day—at least, mine doesn't. Part of that is like "Why aren't you more efficient? Part of it is, my door is—I take a very open door policy, both figuratively and
literally, and that door is open, more than anyone--like more times than it is closed. The students take advantage of that whether it is my hall staff hours or not, they just come in. And I have had students just come in, sit down and put their feet up between classes, not really wanting anything. They just want some place to "hang out" and "chit chat"; and that's fine. I think that's important to working with them. So, if that means I spend fifteen or twenty minutes just "chit chatting" with one of them between classes and that means I need to take a folder home at night to finish a report, I take the folder home rather than tell the student to leave. That's just the way I function.

[When problems do occur, how we handle them] a lot of it, of course, is dependent on the nature of the problem. If it's a particularly sensitive issue or a personal issue, we certainly try to maintain confidentiality and a sense of privacy. A lot of the way people issues are dealt with or handled, is to sit down with one or more of the students involved, hear their side of the story, what their concerns are, what their problems are and then take advantage of what we have available to us to remedy the situation or come to some kind of a sense of resolution. A lot of times, the approach really involves just one-on-one conversation, sometimes that's in a counseling mode, sometimes it's just a shoulder to cry on, and sometimes it's in a very strict
administrative context. I feel it's real important for students to have a say in something, to feel that they're heard. You may not agree with them, but they still need to think they've had their say. So, a lot of times, problems are dealt with by letting one or more students who are involved come in and just vent. "We don't like this! We don't agree with it! We want it changed." Many times what they want changed can't be changed; so then the thing that's real important for us to do is to explain why. Not just to say, "Well, that's how it is. Live with it!"; but rather to say, "This is why that policy was developed or this is why that action was taken. This is why, because of confidentiality reasons or whatever, I can't discuss this in anymore detail." Not just cutting them off, so, a lot of times, we resolve the problems by explaining why we can't resolve them the way they want. Again, they don't have to agree with you, but, at least, they feel like somebody listened to them and understood what they were saying even if they didn't agree.

After thirteen years there is not a whole lot of unexpected [situations]. I think here at UD, one of the things that can be problematic for some is that this is a very conservative institution. Politically, religiously, etc. We have a number of students who feel very strongly about their politics, their religious beliefs, their beliefs
about how society should run, and about how people should be. They are entitled to those beliefs, but sometimes, some of them are not always as open to the fact that someone else may see things a little bit differently and have a valuable and viable perspective. So part of the problem that we sometimes run into, (I hate to call it close-mindedness, that’s a little bit harsher than I want) but a little bit of a narrow perspective. And trying to broaden their perspective can be a real battle sometimes. When that’s at play in trying to resolve a problem or situation, it really makes communication very difficult, because people aren’t particularly open to communication and they may see things in a very black and white perspective, a very right or wrong outlook. It’s like, “I’m right! You’re wrong! I win, you lose!” I think what our goal, as educators, in that should be, is to resolve the situation, of course, but also to make that a teachable moment. In terms of how do you handle problems and how do you handle it when you’re that strongly opposed in opinion or approach, and yet, at the same time, how do you do that in a civil fashion. So that’s part of what we deal with. We have a lot of the typical kinds of scenarios that most colleges can have. Nothing really jumps to my mind that makes us overly unique in terms of how things are presented or what issues come up. We’re pretty much garden variety in all respects.
Our difficulties or barriers. Money! Budget is an issue for everybody. Facilities. We are in desperate need of space on this campus and not just student life, but academics, administration. We need to expand, but, of course, that ties back into the money; because you can’t build a building if you can’t pay for it I think one thing that is to UD’s advantage is, over the time that I have been here, I have seen real progress in the student life deal. We had students when I first got here, with a dominant perspective, that I was picking up, during my first years, that was: "But this is UD." As in, we’re not typical. We’re not like other colleges; or that our students are so much different that nothing that happens in the field is relevant here. People have moved quite a bit from that to the perspective that: "Yes, our students are extremely bright, they are very talented. We really do pull, (It sounds like bragging, but it’s true) we really do pull the cream of the crop into this institution and we’re darn proud of it! But, at the same time, these are 18, 19, 20 and 21 year-old young people and they are going through a growth process and a maturation process that is not too dissimilar to that of any other person their age, whether they are in college or not.

So, what we find is important in terms of addressing a barrier, and I think we’ve done this over the last few
years, is to realize, I meant to say, normalize because we are anything but mediocre, to really kind of look at what our students really like; rather than administrators or faculty sitting in their offices and saying, "Well, I think they are like this," or "I think they want that." I think there has been a stronger push in two ways: one is to ask the students what they want, just ask them, "What are your needs and priorities?" Secondly, in the last five years or so, is the first time they really have had a full complement of professional student development staff. Before, they have had a couple here and there, one for housing or for a development person, but it was like one or two people out of the entire staff. Now, this is what we're trained for, this is why we're here. That has made a real big impact and it has really torn down some barriers because, not only do we know what we're are doing, but we are able to articulate beyond our own office. The fact that, between our staff and the students, that we know what we are doing and what it is we are doing. But, to get back to terms ongoing barriers: budget, space, and kind of like it's important not even having enough time to do everything, because we haven't. I think we haven't even scratched the tip of the iceberg of what we could do here.

Each of us tends to kind of have his or her own area that is fairly well-defined, kind of like the areas I
mentioned earlier that I have. We do interact a great deal and cross over those various areas. For example: the director of housing. Obviously, he handles the facilities, room assignments, the accounting procedures, the computerization system, the conference work and all that and I handle the "res hall" elective programming and staff; but there is no way those two are going to operate totally independently. So, we both take primary responsibility for our areas, but we also interact extensively to coordinate these efforts.

There is an organization chart which does pretty much lay out who reports to whom, who interacts with whom, on what level and that sort of thing, but because we are small and are into doing different things and supporting what each other is involved in it really just tends to kind of fall together within that structure. I can go to the student activities person, and can talk about something that relates to hall programming, bottom line though, I am the one who is going to be held responsible for hall programming.

All of us in here, answer to the Dean of Students. Below me, individually, the residential life staff, all of them: Y" directors, assistant"Y" directors, R.A's. Those are the ones that can be called in any sense of the word, employees. we have our volunteer groups, our student
mentors. our student orientation leaders— all of them, I supervise. Then the groups that we advise, like I advise our office group. That would be a quote/unquote "reporting relationship"; but that's -- individual persons that I advise; that's kind of stretching it in some respects, at least for mine. Now the student government reports to the Assistant Dean for Student Activities -- that is really more of a reporting relationship, even though she is classified as their advisor.

[How many people, students and staff report to me?] I can figure it out: This year it's between 50 and 55 this year. And the reason I say this year, is that the student orientation leader number can vary from year to year, so I'm going to offer this year's number. I would say the maximum I have ever had was, say, around 75.

To be totally candid, I know an evaluation process takes place, but I couldn't describe it if I wanted to. That's a little touchy to try to describe, but that's okay. The Dean of Students, because I report to him, would be the person who does the evaluation. In the past, we have had, well, sit-down and talk meeting as part of the evaluation process. Sometimes it is quite a bit more formal than others. Usually, at least once if not more, during the year, usually it's about once each semester; he will sit down and
talk with each staff member about his reflections on the past semester or the past year, depending on when he’s doing this and then goals and objectives for the future, the next semester, or the next year. The development of that part of that does involve the budgetary control aspect. Essentially like, "Did we handle the money right?" Is everything all nice and straight and kosher so the auditors are not going to have to deal with us about its use. So, that’s usually the process that takes place at my level. In terms of my own process of being evaluated, it’s probably more formal than it looks, but it seems pretty informal.

[Goals and objectives are spelled out for us]
Particularly this year. We have been doing it for a while, but we really got into it quite a bit this year. Each of us within our own areas, our own divisions, our own units, developed a list of goals and objectives for the upcoming academic year. Some of them were short-term, some of them were long-term goals. Each of us submitted those to the dean, who reviewed them and prepared an overall list of those goals and objectives which were then distributed to everybody in the division. There has been an ongoing discussion about those goals, particularly with an emphasis on whose going to take key responsibility for accomplishing that goal. It would logically, seem -- well, if I submit a goal for, say freshman orientation, that I’m going to be the
one responsible for doing that, but that does not mean that
I'm the only one who may have an interest in making it
happen. So, one person may submit a goal or objective, but
three persons may end up assuming it as kind of a
responsibility. That's kind of where we are at this point.
We have pretty much determined our priorities, because the
bottom line is when you write goals and objectives,
everything can't always happen as as quickly as you'd like.
We also, some of us, have a real bad tendency to be
extremely optimistic about our time and energy--getting a
little carried away. When you sit down and say what can you
realistically accomplish with limited resources and limited
time, where are your priorities? You may like to do "A"
here, but "B" over there may really be where the key
priority must be. So, we sort through all that until we come
up with a final list that's in fairly close agreement. I
understand that list is then shown to the president by the
dean, so he knows kind of what we are looking at.

[I know when you have done a job well] besides just the
intrinsic satisfaction, which is really a lot of the key,
there are some opportunities where you get the external
remarks: "Atta girl, good job!", that sort of thing. Quite
frankly, a lot of it tends to be informal. It tends to be a
colleague saying,"That was a very good program," or, "That
was a good idea," or,"I'm glad someone is finally addressing
that issue," or something like that. Sometimes, directly from a student which, to me, is one. Some of the most key feedback you can get in this business is a student responding positively or appreciatively, saying," I learned something from that," or "I got something from that."

We’ve been doing something more recently when we had a residence hall burn, Two weeks ago, not all the way to the ground, but we lost about a third of the building or so. It happened to be a lounge area, so living areas were not hit too much. But, there was some damage and hopefully, this weekend, we’ll get to bring the last half of the hall residents back into the hall. We had some displacement. That’s not a small incident. That’s been --- days, practically, that some of those in the residence halls who -- well, those guys were getting a little thin and wanting to know what’s going on. There were a lot of fresh involved, dealing with the staff, through all of that. It’s the little things: it’s a student who’s been displaced, who had to move all of his possessions, who has to live someplace else for two weeks. All of it happened just before mid-term, everything going on, and with all that happening, having a student ask you something and then telling you,"I really appreciate everything you are trying to do for me. I really appreciate somebody caring about what happens to me." Not as a criticism of this institution
at all, but, I can just imagine if this was at UT-Austin, they’d be out in the street with a number about their neck. Those are the little things. Little things are more of the statements and the validations that you are doing ok. There is not a real formal process that comes down to tell you you’re doing ok; that you are appreciated, that sort of thing. And I don’t think that’s a bad deal in a lot respects. There is really a kind of internal feeling, that kind of warm fuzzy feeling where you go home dead tired, but you really are "hyped": "Yes! It worked!"

Within the academic area [I work with]: the Registrar's office, quite extensively, Admissions. We have a campus in Rome, so we work with the Rome coordinator quite a bit. In fact, we pick the hall staff for the Rome campus and do part of the training. Our Provost, quite a bit, and then, selected faculty based on need, subject and topic. But, I’d say the key ones are: the Registrar of Admissions, the Provost, the food services certainly. Those would be the key ones that come to my mind because the rest is just academia as a whole.

[Our contact with other units are done] very, casually. Very informally. Most of the time, often, it’s face to face. We run into each other on the mall, in the cafeteria or the university center. Running a close neck and neck race with
that is on the "phone. There is written communication. That's not insignificant. A lot of times, that's also to provide a history and the documentation, a reference point in fact. But, quite honestly, most of the things that happen, happen because you pick up a "phone and call whoever you need to get help.

We tend to operate in a lot of realms, fairly independently. Certainly, for funding, we make a funding request just like everybody else does at the university, and it goes to those mysterious powers-that-be, and we pretty much wait to see how it comes out. For a lot of these things, yeah, we are dependent on probably from the president on down through the university council for support. There are cooperative relationships with admissions and offices like that. I don't know if dependent necessarily, is the word for it, but it sure helps a lot; and vice versa for them. When they have visitation days. They rely upon us quite a bit with the parents and to do things with the visiting families and stuff. In terms of a lot of other areas, we are really not dependent on many folks, but we do try to maintain a good positive, constructive partnership with them and I think, for the most part, we have done so successfully.
I would say, across the board, [the relations with other units are] pretty good. I am sitting here thinking, "Is there anybody here we have a problem with?" and I can't think of anyone. We don't always agree on things and our priorities are not the same, but I can't think of any area where there is a really bad working relationship or a hostile working relationship. A lot of our communications with them are keyed into making them aware of what we do, and why it's important and we really do have to kind of sell ourselves.

[No real uncertainties or problems] nothing that seems out of the ordinary or unusual. Again, a lot of it seems to be educating them, showing them why student services are of value; that we are not just over-glorified cruise directors; this whole thing of--we do more than just playing the parties. They need to see our staff as educators and that's been part of our goal, to really inform the faculty and others on the campus why it's important to have what we offer, that it's not frivolous, that it's not just a lot of fluff. One of the ways I try to do this is in the way I refer to our residence halls. I talk about the excellent education that they get in the classrooms and the powerful education they can take, but it's not going to do much good if they don't internalize it into their lives. They have to be able to live their education and a lot of the
opportunities to do that, occur in the interactions with
other people, with their roommates, their peers, or
whomever. That happens very often in residence halls; so I
refer to the residence halls as living laboratories. That’s
where you take what you hear in the classrooms and you carry
it with you as you cross the third floor lab and you put it
into practice. That’s why I call them living labs.

Contacts external to the university or ourselves, I
think that some are informal and fairly extensive,
particularly with certain ones. Contacts tend to occur in
the same ways that I mentioned as communication before:
memos, ‘phone, direct face-to-face contacts, or meetings
sometimes. Meetings, some of them can be really helpful,
because they give us a chance to sit down and communicate
effectively. People know exactly what we’re talking about.
If there is a need for clarification, we take care of it
then, admissions, for example. The admissions office and
our staff have, over the last few years, have tended to make
a point of just meeting occassionally, at least one a year,
or once a semester, if possible, to just kind of catch up,
to see what is going on, to see how we can support each
other. Retention is a real hot issue now, so obviously,
both of us have pryd into that. The contacts tend to be
both of an informal and formal nature. The formality of the
contact probably is a link with the parties involved. My
contacts, for example with the president and the provost, tend to be just a tad more formal than my contacts with, say, the comptroller, because we just have a different kind of relationship there. Also, I tend to have more frequent contact with some staff, like our comptroller, for example, than I do with the provost or president. And while, that just has to do with just academic professionalism. While, outside the university, the contacts tend to be a lot the same way, but the contacts tend to be, for the most part, much more formal.

We don't have a hospital or a physician on staff. We have a clinic nurse, who is here during the school day. She can certainly treat basic kinds of-- the flu and stuff like that, and certain minor injuries, but she can also use referral network that we have with physicians in the community. So we are not in any competition with any of the medical community in the Irving or Dallas areas. We are very much dependent upon them for our referrals. The same thing with our counseling and all. We can handle the basic situational, developmental type of issues, things that are short term. We are not set up for long term therapy. We use a referral network with mental health professionals as well. Basically, I'm it when it comes to the counseling services at UD and I have no interest and I have no time to do anything like private practice. So I'm not in any
competition with a professional in the area either. I can't think of too many things that we have that would be considered in competition with anyone because we are rather isolated, we don't have -- some schools will have, like, a strip of restaurants, shops, things like that, office supply, school supply places. We don't have that around us, so that the competition we may be in, it isn't close by; so they really are not in competition with us and we are not in competition with them.

I think we need to have somebody, this is just my theory now, tell how the university, as a whole, is interacting with the community. I don't think we need all of the little picky details, but I think we need to be a little bit better informed. For example, what is development doing in the community to generate some revenue for the university? I don't think we need to know exactly what so and so costs...; this CEO...; this is what the conversation...; this is what they ordered for lunch while they were talking, but I do think it is helpful to know if development is approaching Exxon, Zales, Trammel Crow, or whoever it is, you know and I think it is important because you don't want to complicate things. If we get an opportunity to experience, or something like that-- we don't want to go to the well twice or too many times. So I think it's kind of like just sensible. I think it would be helpful
for us to have some sort of idea of what priorities are being set for the university as a whole. That kind of information seems better without showing up. It still could be inclusive, but how do we make it do that way? Sometimes, [our main resources] is financial resources, usually, it's information resources, guidelines, just kind of-- more of a sense of being in the know, a look at what's happening. Sometimes that can be translated into, for example, a group kind of adopting the university for a project. For example, an adult person is working with a group of, the name escapes me now, off the tip of my head, but it is an organization of professional women in Dallas, in terms of providing mentor relationships for students, interviewing possibilities. Internships, things like that, I think that those are beneficial and those are the kind of relationships you sometimes get probably some of the best resources that come directly to us that we can see for more information. Now they are renovating the building. It's going to be used for office space and other facilities and residential facilities that I would want direct involvement, to be directly involved with it. I am assuming from my association with the director of housing how the money was coming, target dates, dates for starting and completion and like that, a lot of times it's not easy to really pin point that endeavor. You just have to wait and see how it comes down the pipe.
Well, I think the parameters we are most dependent on, in my opinion, are the students. They are our jobs to work with. Well, certainly we are dependent on the president and the upper administration. I mean, how shall I phrase it? We serve at their pleasure. We are very much dependent upon them for information, for resources, for guidance, that sort of thing. In terms of the most direct dependence those would be the two that I see. I don't see a dependence with the faculty, for example. I see the definite need for partnership there, but we shouldn't consider necessarily--I guess we are the same as any other unit on the university campus. We can do things without necessarily having a very positive relationship; but it sure complicates things, but we do have a good positive relationship with pretty much anybody I can think of, and that really smooths things along.

External to the university, probably our Board of Councilors, like our board of trustees, that's who I say we are most dependent on just because of their role to the university. Otherwise, I think the dependency is more of a development question in terms of who they are soliciting from and what approaches they are making, but that's a reaction, in a lot of respects. Yes, the Board of Councilors. You see, it's c-o-u-n-c-i-l-o-r-s, councilors like a student council, not counselors like guidance
counselors. They are members of the business community, the
diocese, the bishop and others -- they are basically our
equivalent for any board of trustees for a university.

Within the university, I'd say there's limited
problems. They crop up now and then within internal groups
on campus. No real big problems--they tend to be
situational and be resolved as situations. Generally,
problems are limited and minor.

The dean of students is the division head. He reports
directly to the president. To the dean of students just
about everybody else in the division, at least at a certain
level, report to him. The director of housing reports to
him. The director of fees, and the director of career
development report to him. The director of the university
center, and the clinic nurse report to him. The athletic
director reports to him. Some of those staff do not have
anyone else to report to them. The director of the student
center, you know she has some student workers, but that is
about it. Most of our staffs tend to be students, either
student workers or student volunteers. Those of us who have
staff who wouldn't fall into that category of reporting
would be: the athletic director -- all of the coaches report
to her. Student workers tend either to report to the
coaches or to the office administrator or whoever. Then,
for myself it would be the -quad-choir-- directors, who are employees, and then, the assistant -quad-choir- directors, the "RA's" or student staff and they all come up through me.

I think the expectation [here] certainly is that you conduct yourself in a professional and competent fashion; that you have the best interests of the people you are serving, that is, the students, at heart; that you conduct yourself in an honest, ethical fashion; that you don't do anything, that is, say or do anything that is going to be detrimental to the students or the university; that those of us who have any financial responsibilities, that we are fiscally responsible and competent; and that, generally, that we exercise our expertise and that we do our jobs to the very best of our abilities. Generally, I say those pretty much serve us well.

[The benefits here are] very good! I mean there is a retirement program for our staff. There is a medical program, those who have dependent family members can include those there. The university had a system where you accrue sick leave and vacation days and you can take those. It's probably just like any other organization. If you are going to take a vacation, you just co-ordinate it with your unit so there is coverage for things that need to be covered.
The staff have the opportunity to take course work here at no charge, up to, I think, 6 hours a semester. A number of staff have taken advantage of that. Some of them have even pursued and attained degrees. There is certainly a support to professional development through professional organizations, conferences, seminars, things like that. Involvement in professional activities, where there is a limit to that, again ties back to budget and travel. That's very limited, so you really have to set your priorities. Some of us, at least three of us, are very involved in national or regional professional organizations, including serving in officer roles; so that really does take up a lot of the professional development opportunities for us.

Informal groups, I think because we are so small that there are probably not a lot of, I don't want to say underground because that has a connotation that I don't really mean; but I don't think there are a lot of things that are not just right there on the surface. As for interaction between, I think some of the networks tend to be just a little more social. For instance, one of the accounts payable or business office personnel and I—we go grab lunch together. We sit down and we catch up. Oh, sometimes we talk shop, although we try to avoid that, but sometimes it is the only time we can get together, but more often we also talk about the family, the kids, the vacation the new house
or whatever. That tends to kind of cross lines, administration, clerical, students, faculty, across the board.

[They get along] for the most part. I don’t think they’d hang around together if they didn’t. They help one another. Because one group can learn from another and say "Hey, I need some help." Then someone will pitch in and say "My student workers can, that’s the advantage at being at a small campus. Everyone gets to know one another better. It’s a very positive and supportive.

Several of these groups I feel comfortable coming in and out of. For the most part, although it would vary from group to group. When someone has something they are very proud of. For example, I had secured a program that I never thought we would get, never thought we would have enough money or data open. We can afford it, they have the data, and it’s going to happen. When those kind of things happen you can share them with someone. They the program, but you can tell them because it is a good thing for the program. "Tell me more about it", that kind of thing. That is usually the kind of nature of the support and encouragement. Its a way we keep up with things. Also, sometimes we need little favors now and then. Like in the business office, "I know you needed this earlier, I should
of gotten this thing in the week before, but I just found out I need this tonight. Can you get this checked back tonight." But, we don't burn our bridges off that. You don't make it a habit, but every now and then if you need it, they do it.

The dean generally gives all of us fairly wide latitude of autonomy. We can go to him with questions. I make it a habit of bouncing things around with him that I think may come back to haunt us. If it is a difficult situation in the hall or a contrevarsary program that, I just like him to know about it. So, if someone has a problem that way he hears from me first.

Most of the other time the relationship tends to be FYI people. If I was going to be completely honest, I think our Dean has a good heart and the best of intentions. But, I don't know if he necessarily knows what goes on day to day in his office.

I would say he has good intentions and a good heart, but it can also be very frustrating. That would be the best. A lot of that tends to be, even with his good heart and good intentions, he often tends to be too removed to really be an advocate. Simply because you can't advocate strongly for something you aren't familiar with. A lot of
times that means a reliance on things that sound very rhetorical and almost clichish, and that just doesn't fly in this business.

I think sometimes we can drive each other batty. But across the board I think it is a positive working relationship, a solid one. I have learned a great deal from some of my colleagues. I would like to think that maybe they have learned from me as well, but I don't want to be as presumptuous to say I know that they have. But I know for example, our Director of Housing, I have learned a great deal about that side of housing. I knew res.life, but I learned alot about his end of the housing operation from him. The working relationship I think can be characterized as supportive of being all of us tarping for the benefit for our major constituency, that being our students. And I think it is positive.

[We chat alot] It is really easy to go to someone and say, "I need some help with this, or can I bounce this off of you?" And some of us have had experience, for example I have had some grant experience. One of my colleagues was trying to write a grant earlier this week for something, and it was a different part from the same program where I had gotten my grant. So she literally picked me up from the airport and I read her grant. And that is the kind of
support. You sit there, you talk, you bounce things around, you critique, you do whatever. It is a very giving environment. We never keep our mouths shut. We make a real point in trying to communicate publicity. You may have seen all of the flyers when you came in. Whether it is our programs, meetings or whatever. You know we really try to get our publicity out. We probably could use our student newspaper more better than we do. That is another avenue that we have used in the past. Word of mouth alot, too. Again, that is part of the advantage of having a small campus. Through our residence halls, alot of students do live on campus, through hall meetings, announcements by halistaff, and alot just by talking it up.

Depending on what the decision is. Alot of the times the decision is made by whatever staff member who is responsible for that area. Generally, we are good at touching base with whoever also may be affected by the decision or who might have some input of value. Generally, if I am making any major Res. Life decision, I will run it across the Director of Housing. We will talk about, but what I do advise __________ chapter. I go with that, and I take responsibility if I don’t check any of that out with anyone. The big, big decisions usually come out of the Dean’s office, but often times not always, after
consultation at his request or our insistence with other staff who have a relevant perspective on the situation.

[On decisions affecting me] I would say I have a fairly good amount [of my opinion considered]. That doesn’t mean we always agree or my opinion is listened to. But I don’t have any hesitancy going into anyone’s office, and I don’t think they have any coming into mine, and say "I think we need to talk about this or I have a feel about this." That doesn’t mean people listen, but you can at least go in and have your say. Nobody is going to slam the door in your face and not give you a chance to say it. Generally, I would say across the board, it’s okay. It’s pretty good. There have been times I am hearing about things after the fact, but that is rare in all honesty. The way it tends to sometimes happen is we will appear to be making a decision, and after he has already kind of gotten his mind made up, he will present it. I think it is kind of a style not an agenda to it. He may say we are going to sit down and talk about this decision, but he has already gotten a decision made. He is really asking for feedback on it, or you have to play devil’s advocate, or pitch another perspective if you have one. And, this doesn’t happen all of the time, it isn’t an ongoing thing or process. But sometimes this consultation is really more of convincing me my decision
isn't the right one to go with. If you can, you will listen to it.

[The really influential people here] would be really hard to say. I think it depends on what the issue is. If I think it is a res. life issue then yeah, I think I am one of the influential people. If it has to do with sports and recreation, I don't have any influence. I can express my opinion and they will be respectful to take me in, but in terms of having any influence, no. I think all of us have a degree of influence, but it depends on what it is. If anyone across the board who probably tends to have some ongoing influence, it tends to be the Director of Housing. And, that's just because he has been here longer than any of us.

The staff [really control what is going on]. I don't think it is really one person, it relates back to the particular area and the staff members who are most responsible for that area.

[To get ahead around here] you better produce. You do your job. There are definitely politics involved. It's hard to describe those politics because they vary. They are those kind of things that are vague when you describe, but in your gut you know what they are. And sometimes it
changes, quite honestly, depending on how someone's mood is. There is not an overt playing favorites or anything like that. But every now and then, you can tell if you are not exactly the favorite child sort of speak. I have to be quite honest and answer to that is somewhat biased to what my own professional opinion of what it takes to get a head whether it is in an organization or elsewhere. You have to walk what you talk. You have to be able to make things happen, and be a part of a program. Some creative thinking and a little bit of a Maverick streak. There is a place for that here within this unit, within the organization, but there is a limit to it as well. If you exceed the limit, you are going to get shut down.

[Rewards here] they let you live. Of course the pay, there is certainly that. But beyond you show up, you do your job, you get your paycheck. To be really honest, it goes back to the honor question. There are more intrinsic than extrinsic rewards. Just that feeling of you know you are doing a good job, and you know it is appreciated by the people who really matter, and that's the students. In this unit, if you have something that is really good you like you get a grant, you are elected to a leadership role in the profession, you present a paper or something. It's really up to the individual staff members, it's in his or her hands to make that known. There isn't a formal structure. There is
an internal newsletter for the university that comes around every two weeks or so. That is where we say who presented what at conference, who has something published, things like that, if someone who has received a recognition from the community or in their profession. Now there will be some units who are mostly, who have academic standard, if something happens they send it in, it is just a form. Out of student life, if you want something in there you an individual staff member has to take responsibility for getting that in. You really have to blow your own horn.

There are really no external show for achievement other than the fact if you do something really good, if you get a really good program off the ground, it sticks with you. It's very survival is kind of a reward.

Most of the time [differences] are resolved just by the people involved, sitting down to hash them out. This is what I think, and this is what I think, how are we going to resolve it. I would say probably 98% of the time that is how it is done, informally between the people involved and in generally an unheated manner. It's a business discussion. In that remaining 2%, and those are very rare, it may involve larger, staff discussion. A bigger deal than one or two people sitting down, and maybe in a larger, bigger picture perspective. Very rarely is there such a
disagreement that it is a win-lose situation. That does not happen very often at all.

I love my job! I love this university. I love my profession. I came here five years ago because I wanted a generalist position, some place I could work in areas I could learn. That has happened. Now there have been some frustrating experiences, but there have been some real learning experiences. My goal professionally is I want to be a dean or vice president within the next two or three years. This has been a very good training ground for me. I have learned about some areas that have strengthened me. I may never be a director of housing, but at some point I will have some directory of housing authority. I need to know what's going on in that person's world. I need to be informed because of education and learning from the Director of Housing here, I feel better prepared to do that. To interact with that person, so I am a good administrator and good supervisor. I have also come across a few things a part of the education where I have said "I would never do that."

[What makes me feel the most satisfied] students, students, and the students. Probably one of my biggest concerns about moving up in my career is the further up you go in administration, the less contact with the
students. And that is something I don’t want to see happen. The satisfaction is the relationship I have with them. Sometimes it is just knowing you helped somebody and they appreciate it. Sometimes that helping is just helping them take care of themselves. You haven’t really done anything for them, you haven’t fixed it. They fixed it. The relationship between the hall staff and the people who I have worked with a period of a couple of years. To watch them literally grow up, who come in as those little dumb cocky freshmen, and watch them come out as mature, responsible, educated, solid citizens. That goes back to the intrinsic. That is extremely satisfying for someone in my business. And frankly, I can’t see being in any other business. This is what I wanted to do, I just didn’t fall into this. It was a conscious choice. And the satisfaction right now it seems I have more than my share, but I have alot of different things to do. This is not dull at all. I like variety, and I find that very satisfying.

[What makes me feel the least satisfied] oh boy! Feeling like sometimes we have to justify our existence, not just our programs, but our very existence. That we are superflous to the university as a whole. Alot of people don’t think that way, but fair numbers give that impression. It is very unsatisfying to come in literally at seven or eight in the morning and not go home til nine or ten at
night on a regular basis, and then have people misunderstand what you are doing or not be informed at all. Simply not being informed about the kind of programs you are doing or saying "You guys don’t do anything for these areas." "Let me tell you what we do for that area." And they say "I didn’t know you did that", and you say "Why didn’t you inform yourself." This immediate criticism, again this doesn’t happen from everybody and I try to remember those people who do know better. Quite frankly, and these are one of those tricky things to respond to, part of the area of unsatisfaction is, how do I put this nicely, I think we would benefit more if we had stronger leadership in our senior administrator ie: the Dean of Students, I don’t want that interpreted as the President. We need stronger leadership and advocacy, we have to battle. But in comparision, every school usually has to battle, that is nothing new. We particularly need a strong leader and someone who can articulate what we are all about, and why we are about that, and what we can offer as a partner in the university. We don’t really have that, and that’s frustrating.

I wish I could word for word remember the entire mission statement of the university, because that is what [our purpose] ties into. To support that mission in everything we do. To promote a healthy environment. An
environment that supports the academic pursuits of our students. To create an environment that enhances the learning process. As with any student service area to enhance, promote, support the individual, personal development of the students.

Hopefully, I would like to think that in every program that we do, every thing, every contact, every conservation, every meeting that we attend, every decision that we make about how we set our priorities, and how we use our resources [is how we pursue our mission]

[How I would describe UD to a friend] oh, well varied, very diverse. Certainly not boring, very exciting and particularly when you have the students come in and out all of the time. Creative and challenging, definitly very challenging. Usually in a good sense. Ocassionally, not in such a positive sense. And then, on ocassion, it can be very frustrating. But then again, you have to kind of look to the positive side and sometimes let it overcome the not so positive side.

I think the norms are that you're here on behalf of your constitutes, the studen ts. You can act in a way that is compatible and contributory to the mission of the university. I think that one of the norms is that you do
what you do in a competent professional manner. You recognize where you hit the limit of your own competency and you find someone else who can help. At the same time you try to learn a little more to stretch your competency. I think that on my own perspective at least for me, is that you enjoy what you are doing that is always fond. If you don’t like this business, then get out of it. You have a choice, this isn’t for everyone.

Quality, [is most emphasized here] certainly. Cost is not insignificant. Speed to an extent, but it depends on the situation. We don’t let things drag on and on, but we it isn’t pushed to point you have to worry about the quality being compromised. Innovated measures, I think are acknowledged but I don’t know if they are always acted upon. That again ties back to limited resources. The key things are what you do, and you do them in the highest quality possible. And we can try new things, we can experiment. But before we do new things, you do your homework.

[I am a risk taker] that is the story of my life. Yeah, I do if I am going to do my homework. I am by nature not a high risk taker, but if I feel if it is a calculated risk, and it is not manipulated, and if I have my facts. I am not going to take a risk if I haven’t investigated it and
feel it is worth the risk. But if I make the determination, I'll go for it.

[The kind of support would I receive for initiative] depends on what it was about. In some cases the support would be there. If the support comes from the students, we had a case like this last year. The support was very solid, very strong, and very articulated. In some cases, this is why I think it is so important to do your homework. I have learned over the years with my dean, you better have your ducks in a row. That doesn't mean you are going to get support, but if you don't have your ducks in a row and you can't answer the questions and articulate clearly, if you can't even begin to pre-guess what the issues are going to be, then you really don't stand much of a chance.

I think [criticism] it is very valuable. I think my biggest issue is how it is done. I have always told my students that the door is open. Tell me what you think, tell me why not, tell me how it could be better. I have taken alot of comments over the years from my students and I have made adjustments because they are bright. A student this morning, it wasn't a criticism, but more of a suggestion. And it was extremely valuable, it was a thought I hadn't even thought of that, it was perfect. Where I have a problem with criticism is not the criticism itself, but
how it is addressed, if it is addressed in a personal matter, or if it is addressed unprofessionally. But if it is done in a way of an attack, or done in a way when someone is not willing to listen about how it came about. I am willing to listen to the student about it was irronious, I will either take it into consideration and say maybe you have a point. Or let's look at it, I understand what you are saying, let me explain it to you why it has to be this way. But when someone comes in and wants to rail on you and hasn't bothered to get their facts straight, then I have a real problem with that. My biggest problem, I understand that people have a different perspective but they better get their facts straight. If they check it out and still feel the approach I am taking is wrong, I may not agree with that but I atleast respect it. But when they come in and start saying I am against this because of this, this and this. But then you say but those aren't the facts, let me show you the facts, and then they say I don't care what you got, I am right and you are wrong and you shouldn't be doing this. With that kind of attitude I will chew them out because they aren't interested in the issue and a constructed dialogue. They are interested in pushing their own agenda. I have a problem with that.

I think all of us have our moments in the sun. There's two, one was in orientation, and the other in res. life. In
the contrast to res. life in the past two or three years, we have really refined our selection process of the staff. I am very adamant that it is done this way because it is fair. A small campus has a grapevine and people start saying so and so doesn’t have a chance, or I heard this and that. We keep consistency on the selection process. There’s no discussion with the committee members while selection is going on until everybody has made their decision on who they think would be the best candidate. Then we sit down and talk about them in closed doors. At that point I the committee because I don’t know what everybody else in the committee is thinking. That took a while to get going because that was different from how it had been done. There was a perception of favoriticism going on in the process. And agendas being pushed by certain people by both the students and staff alike. And there was generally a perception that it wasn’t a fair process, and that was very uncomfortable for me. There also was an assumption that once you were on staff it was like being made Pope, you were there for life. And sometimes the staff are not good choices, and we needed a way to get the best staff possible. So we pushed and prodded a little but, I go the Director of Housing to back me up. And we put a process in place that I think is very fair. We have used this for two years now about to use it for three. And I think as a result that the last two staffs I have had have been the best of my whole
career. The other was new student orientation. We wanted to really enhance the new students. We also wanted some mentoring of upper classmen that we hadn’t been using. We wanted more of a push than you are here to register, and have a nice life. Real battles with that because orientation does not officially come out of our office. And yet, almost everything that happens during orientation is done by our staff. It is a real political potatoe going on there, but we pushed along. I did the homework and documented what other campuses have done, where their successes have been in using the orientation advocates for their peers. I am real pleased about the strides our orientation program has taken, but we are still trying to improve it. Those are two areas I take alot of pride in.

Oh, God [one of our failures]! I know one that comes to mind. I am not sure how to describe it adequately. This one is going to be touchy. This is my own opinion, others may not have it, the word failure is probably accurate but hard to address in this context. I think probably where we have dropped the ball across the board in terms of self-promotion. I don’t think we put ourselves out there adequately in terms of addressing our value to the university. It’s not because we aren’t capable of doing but for example, I can’t go to to Board of Counseling or to the President, it would be professional suicide. I can’t
get an appt with the Board of Counseling and say this is what we need and what we are doing in student life, and how we are enhancing the university. That is not how it is done. I would need to go to my Dean. Well the reality is, this isn’t going to get back to my Dean is it? The reality is my dean is not a good communicator, he can not articulate well what we do in this area. Comments tend to be general, globular, cliches, very flowering sounding. You walk out and say "What did we just hear?" We heard alot of words. Alot of shelfway with verbage. That has been proven as a downfall for us. We are not seen in many circles as a real genuine educational value on this campus. Because the very key spokesperson for that value can’t do it, and that is where I think there is a hole. And in terms of some of the rest of us, a part of me says "Maybe if we all band together we can do something about it" But alot of us take the attitude of "I know I am doing a great job, I don’t rely on his evaluation. I will take care of it myself."

I think overall [our unit is effective]. I mean by effective as we are producing. The quality is there. There is always an eye to growth and improvement. Now sometimes that eye has to be shaded by reality. But I think people, even when they are the most frustrated, don’t walk away. Maybe if they do it is just a temporary thing of I got to get out of here. But everybody comes back. What we say we
try to do at the basic sense. These areas as effective
basically as much as we can hope for. But in reality, alot
of us, are very driven to be better and to improve.

I don’t know when the student unit exactly got started.
A little bit of historical perspective up to about 6 years
ago there wasn’t a student development professional staff
member running it. It was either a faculty member or staff.
Our Director of Housing has been here longer than anybody.
He came over as a grad student and stayed. He grew and
assumed the responsibilities. The first type of action that
this was their business was eight or nine years ago. Five
years ago two asst deans, my profession was created in 1988.
That helped round out. The athletic director came that same
year and she was a professional. 1988 was a catalyst year
of growth and had people who were doing what they were
trained to do. It wasn’t someone playing games with it.
Over the last five years it brought about a sense of
professionalism to what we do, as sense of spirit to what we
do. Because we like it, we enjoy it. There is a
perspective in having worked at other institutions.
Perspective that respects academia. I taught before, some
of the rest of us have as well. But this is where we are
primarily, in student services. We bring two views to
tables perspective and experiences from other structures,
other institutions. That has been something that has
contributed to growth here. The last five years have probably been the most evolutionary years for student services here, and I still think we have only scratched the tip. Another reason I think, is because there is such an enormous amount of potential.

In many ways [the organization] hasn't really changed much at all. I think it is happening. I think U.D. prides itself on being very solid through winds of change of higher education. U.D. is always U.D. U.D. takes a lot of pride in that it has not brought in what it sees as conforming to vocational perspective of higher education. More education of education opposed to education for a job. There is still some of that elitish nature of state schools versus private schools. And, I've worked at both, which is real entertaining to watch. I think if it has changed in any way it is because of the nature of the students. I don't think right now there is any way to describe the typical U.D. student. You can come up with statistics, they were this on the S.A.T, This way in high school, this color hair, weigh that much, but you still can not describe the typical U.D student. In the past there were descriptors that probably weren't too far off in describing a typical U.D student. But those days are gone. I think a part of it is because students have been recruited, changing nature of the pool of incoming freshmen. U.D. is attractive to
students for different reasons. A high quality education, with good financial aid packages. Inside the classroom we are hard to beat, but what we outside the classroom we still need to grow.

[Our main challenges] with the organization-university perspective, and since we are doing our accreditation, alot of those issues are coming to the fore front. I think that like any private school a challenge is our viability. We have been very fortunate and very successful retention now is the key. We know it costs less to keep them than it does to get them here. I think maintaining their essence as a western tradition liberal arts institution, in the face of what’s going on in our education in terms of graduates not being able to find jobs. That sort of thing. I don’t think U.D. will ever change that, where there is resistance to any kind of new programs. It is hard to imagine them opening up their arms and embracing us very much. I think the challenge too like any other university is financial support. Money is a problem. I don’t know if U.D. is facing any more challenges than any other small private university. I think one of the changes that continues is concerning the conservative nature, the very conservative nature, that varies in light of the fact we are getting alot of students who come to college to think not to be infiltrated with alot of perspectives. Their
multiculturalism for example is an interesting discussed topic on campus because some see there is value to this, offers a broader range, and it does encourage the thinking process. And then, there are others who think it is just a bunch of literal rhetoric. So it will be interesting to see how U.D. addresses some of the basic questions of higher education over the next couple of years. Within our own unit, I think the challenge is also viability. Are we going to do more with less, or are we going to do the same with less? I think for us, to articulate our viability and why it is important to have us around here. We have growing demand because of the growing different kinds of students for different services and the need for them, counseling, health, student activities. All of those things we need to address, and I think that is one of our biggest challenges. How are we going to maintain quality, continue to grow and innovate while doing all of that with limited staff, limited resources, and do it in a way that helps the students.

The staff without a doubt, [is our main strength] that has to be the first one. The fact that the staff is committed to what it is doing, likes what it is doing. I think another strength is we do draw on our students alot for programs and for our activities, and we nurture them. I think one of our strengths as an university is the about the student lives. I think it goes back to the simple fact that
it is awfully hard for us to take no for an answer sometimes. And when they say "You can't do that" and you say "I just did." I of course take the attitude of it is far easier to get forgiveness than permission. So sometimes that has gotten me in trouble, alot of times that has gotten me in trouble. But it is really a strength for us. As sick as is and as crazy it is, look at my office now and everything I have to get done in a few weeks, and still in my head I think it would really be great if we could start doing more here, start doing that, we could bring this speaker on campus. It is like we never stop. There is always that innovative, creative juice that is flowing. I think that is one of the things that keeps us alive.

As much as it sometimes drives me crazy, I think [the strength of the organization as a whole] is it's consistency. Its consistency in admission and its educational goal it seems to apply. U.D. is what it is. It lays it out there, its direct about it. Either you love it or don't come here. They make no apolgizes for the nature of its education and its a good education. So I think that its consistency and constancy of idenity is one of its strengths. It doesn't sweather in the wind. Another of its strengths are the people who are there, whether its the faculty, staff, or the students. The people who are here are here because they like the place, because it is a niche
for them, and generally if it is not they don't stick around here for long.

[The main problem in] student life [is] trying to maintain or do more with little to nothing. Limited resources are the problem. From my own perspective own view point we need more stronger leadership of the Dean more. I think those are the key things that we have talked about.

[From] my own perspective, I think we need to keep alittle bit better rememberance that one of the reasons alot of us are here are because of the students. I am not one of the radical ones who think the students should be sitting on the Board of Trustees, voting on tenure, and stuff like that. But, I do think sometimes the students aren't heard as much as they should be. Now part of that, quite honestly, is because the students often. I know that is the case in the last few years, they have not exactly voiced their opinions in the most appropriate fashion. They have tried bluffing and stuff like that. They ahve threatened to do a sit in on parent's weekend. Everbody knew it was a bluff, but the administration caved in for them. And they are sitting back saying I can't believe they caved in. But, I think a big thing to remember is the students are not stupid. They can have very valuable perspectives that we ought to listen to. Another problem is simply trying to
grow and trying to support that growth, strictly financially. But also in terms of facilities and everything else just basic growing pains. It isn’t that old of an university and if it really wants to be as it says "The premiere liberal arts education in the South West" then it is going to have to offer alittle more. Now academically it would be tough to beat, we get mentioned in US Report and that sort of thing. But academics isn’t the whole ball game. Somebody has to open up their eyes and realize that the rest of it isn’t just fluff.

I think we need new leadership at the top. I don’t mean anything in a critical sense. He is a very nice man, very good intentions, but he isn’t a leader. And you are talking about the Dean? I am talking about the Dean. Again it is easy to go back and say we need more funding, we need more space, we need more staff. But everybody can say that and everybody is right. If I have to stop and think beyond that, those obvious things. I think we need to change some of our communication stradegies where there is alittle bit more of collaborative effort. There’s an interest and there’s a desire from part of the staff, and that has tended to happen in some staff somewhat informally or in networks. Where alot that gets bogged down is in the upper level in terms they are not being collaborated. Perhaps in his mind he sees as collaborated, but in reality
it is not. We know what we are doing, we are a competent staff. We have a perspective, not all of the time and I am not saying we ought to be consulted on every little thing, who has the time? But I think when we are looking to communicating to whether it is be the President, Provost, Council, the students, I think we need to have a perspective we all abide to.

The most needed change is [that] communication needs to be improved. It is not bad, but it needs to be improved. I think quite honestly, alot of us don't have clear message of these are our priorities being set for the next year, five years, ten years, and etc. We hear about that in terms of construction, deferred maintance, and stuff like that. But there isn't a real clear, tangible, measurable thing. We hear we want to be "The Premier Liberal Arts Small Private Institution of the South West." Well great, we are all behind that, but how are we going to do that. And it goes from there to suddenly the big question mark. And I am not sure that there is a constincy back and forth . Everybody has to feel a part of that process. You go to have the quality of the educational oppportunity. Well we know that, and that has happened. But are we totally out of the picture, is there nothing that we do that contributes that. I think that is somethimes the message that is left across us. Is that if we are going to be "The Premier Liberal
Arts Institution" is it all academic? Certainly I don't think anybody is going to be that crazy to say that is not where the focus should be. People basically come to college for the education. They have better not be coming just for the student activities stuff. But if you know that has been improving, been improved, and are pretty solid. With that then do you just ignore everything else? I think there needs to be better maybe not communication is the word but conclusion. Conclusion is the better word. Where people feel a part of what's going on. I think too that we need to look at the kind of students we recruit. We recruit basically really good, good students. But this is a really tough place to go to school and it is a challenge. I don't think we are doing the students alot of good if there is a good likelihood they are not going to make it. That isn't meant to sound elitish of anything like that. I am going to be real honest with you, I don't think I could of made it in this school. It is tough. I respect this education. But we need to be upfront with students about this is what is expected, and support them in the process because they are going to go through a transition. That goes back to retention issues, if there is a really good likelihood that this person isn't going to make it, are we being fair to them and to ourselves. We always take a certain number of probation type students with conditional acceptance, limited load, and that's okay. But maybe this is happening, but it
seems there are alot of those kids and alot of them don't make. I kind of wonder if we are being as selective as we should be. Of course it is easy for me to say because I don't have the responsibility for it. That's kind of like one of those people I talked about earlier critizing when they haven't done their homework. I could of just been very guilty of it, but those are some of the things. I also think a thing that needs to be improved is U.D. needs to take a big step forward. I think it is poised to do that,, I get the feeling like it is ready to do that. But it just has to get it’s nerve up and do it! Its about 35 years old, lets stop and see where we are and where we are going. And lets get going!
I was born on October 23, 1953, in San Antonio, Texas. When I was nine we moved to Dallas, lived in the inner city of Dallas for six years, right near the Roseland Housing Projects. I guess you could say I was an inner city kid. When I went into high school we moved to Far North Dallas. I lived in the North Dallas, Farmers Branch area. I graduated from W.T. White High School, a middle to upper class school. I had scholarships to a couple of universities, but I chose to go to Dallas Christian College, mainly because it was interesting. It's funny you mentioned substance abuse because I was somewhat of a high school substance abuser. But I felt this was a place that I could get straightened out. I didn't intend to graduate from here but I did graduate from here with a Bachelor's of Art, with my primary area in Religion. I went into a youth pastorage in Midland, Tx from 1976 to 1981. I took some graduate work in Behaviour Science at the University of Texas, Permian Base. I moved to Dallas in 1981 to work in the college as an Administrative Assistant or a Recruiter. Then certain areas were added - eventually, I had the added responsibilities until I took over Director of College Relations. I oversee the areas of recruitment, admissions,
alumni and staff. I know I look young, but anyway. I took some course work at the University of North Texas - graduated with a degree in Higher Education Administration so I have a lot of graduate hours I have completed in my Master's Program. It's mainly experience. I entered at a different position. At this point, I would say I would be Vice President of Relations. I work directly out of the president office.

I am an Administrator. I coordinate various people and oversee the various works that are done. I work with groups of students - service projects. Things that I work with are Inner-City-Teens, an inner city of Dallas program. I oversee it, it's hands-on, it's the heart of this, it's what I want to do. I also work with groups. So, I grew up in the area. I oversee the schedule of choirs on tours - make sure the majority of events run smoothly. I keep busy. I work a lot directly with students to make sure that they have the opportunity to do whatever they would like to do.

The actual job title [I hold] would be Director of Church Relations or Vice President of College Relations or it could be flunky. I work under Public Relations or Development. I'm a part of Development, basically there are people who predominately work raising funds or grants. I usually spend them - that's the way it works. [I have been in] recruitment
two years. After that I oversaw recruitment, admissions, [and] alumni. Basically I just moved up.

[The work] it's diversified with various areas. Overall, the various people who work in areas of my department would work as administrators, they basically come and meet with me, I basically trouble-shoot. I make sure that goals are achieved and direction is clarified, what new goals need to be set, what we need to do, how we need to do it. We're a small college, focused, not liberal arts, not diversified, a small market. We have to make sure the market is totally cultivated and saturated. The person who works with alumni, [also] works with athletics. They meet with me, coordinate specifics of how we can work together, use the alumni to go after other people. Cultivate certain funds, work with groups of people. Each department has different functions within itself, much like the University of North Texas.

My main responsibility is to communicate with the President, he does not like surprises. I need to communicate with him, it could be personal. He is definitely my boss. We have a good working relation. I have an assistant that coordinates everything. She and I have an informal relation.

The major thing we have to do is constantly keep the college in their [outside organizations] minds. Yesterday, I called one of our alumna's in Houston for a fundraising event in Oklahoma City. Well, I'm talking to him and everything seems to be very gung-ho. When we got off the phone. I have
to make sure that he stays interested in the college, so he can raise the bucks.

I mainly work with a variety of groups, high school students, adult learners, church groups, a variety of organizations, urban groups, a black evangelism enterprise in the inner city, or groups that work with inner city culture. I work with Food Pantry, groups that feed the homeless and I work with alumns. It varies. It sounds almost political and I hate politics in education but you are aware that it is prevalent. We have to work with big money people - all the way to the top. I would rather work with the poor.

Politics is a big part of it. The most frustrating thing is you have to put out low fires. Take a look at A&M and that one frat party with an almost KKK-type event. The frat house did something inappropriate, people dressed in robes and painted their faces black and mocked a hanging and burned a cross in the front yard. When people or news media get involved you have to do a lot to turn the tide and not have everyone look down at A&M. You might see something at SMU, like kids playing on elevators. I can sympathize and empathize with the people there. It's crazy in a private institution. They'll have to do a lot to offset that bad P.R. That's probably the hardest part of my job. The other is to coordinate the students and get them going in the right direction or in the same direction, [become] familiar with the diversity of students that are in your classroom and get them
going in the same direction and feeling good about it - it’s a hard job. The other hard part is do it with your staff, get them going in the same direction and keep them happy, salary-wise, job happiness. A staff person the other day was frustrated, I told them to take the day off. They don’t all necessarily, you know communicate, if they hear one directive. That’s a part of it. The clarification of what’s said and what’s done.

We did a poster that was printed and we wanted changes but changes weren’t made for a lack of communication. And those posters cost alot of money, printing money, someone got stuck with the boxes. They were done, we had to re-do the boxes. A person walked by and hit the roof. We had to put the boxes of posters, almost in hiding. So, someone wouldn’t accidently come upon them, so we recycled them. Being careful because if they had been posted anywhere our job would have been forfeited.

I’m real laid back. I don’t get mad easily. I’m not a cut-throat business guy. I’m a people person. That’s a problem, when a problem arises. People around me are more defensive. If they make a mistake they probably feel worse. If there’s a problem or a mistake with the resident he’s not as laid back. Be careful to keep communication open with him. Like with the poster deal, it was an expensive part of our budget, but it’s just a drop in the bucket. That upset him majorily. He has to be concerned with the overall image of
the school, those supporters or donors, [we are] not state funded.

If there is a position or department that is a catch all, it’s this one. If we want to establish a new area in my department it overlaps, in academics, development. When tension is in my area [it affects all] areas. If academics doesn’t stay on top of current trends in education that will affect my job. For instance, the communication with the TEA was not accurate. Yesterday, we had a scare in our program that wasn’t current. The communication wasn’t there. We had a high level meeting yesterday. We were up [until] 1 p.m. re-checking, re-verifying. I was a part of it. The Vice President of Academic Affairs had a meeting to see how it will affect the school. My job is handy-man, fix it, never boring.

In the area of communication: gets what’s in my head into other person’s head, it’s an obstacle. Go through proper channels. Every Saturday, we deal with 30-80 kids in inner-city housing projects, alternate Saturdays. We have to get people with current commercial driver’s license (CDL) to move kids in buses. If they need to go rollerskating. It sounds simple, but it’s not. We have to take vans, go through red tape with people in charge of vans, have to fill out forms, why you have to do it, we are not really used to it in a college-university setting, coming up with money for inner-city kids. Last weekend, kids were going to have a carnival in Texarkana, they didn’t go through the right channels,
picked up material that they didn’t need. The supervisor gets a call and says "your people did this". This is an example of red tape, not talking about the business office.

The work is coordinated by the President and the cabinet with advisors who give directives. I have the same on smaller scale with evaluations every year. I oversee the budget in my department. I coordinate with the business office.

Quality control [is] through the accrediting association, reports must be given in house. We constantly update 5, 10, 20 year plans.

The president, or board of directors pats you on the back and you get your name mentioned. I know when I do a good job, when I accomplish goals that I have set out to do. Being in peace with myself, doing the best I can do, if that’s not good enough for the president, then so be it. It doesn’t have to be a pat on the back. The president and I have a good relation. We don’t play games with him. Bigbucks aren’t always there. I constantly praise them, tell them what I like about them. I believe in what I’m doing. It’s rare for a guy in administration to stay there for eleven years. The first four to five years were ulcer-city. My biggest fear in that regard is that I don’t want people to assasinate my character behind my back because of a job I’ve done or haven’t done. The bottom line is you don’t second guess.

[We communicate in] a variety of ways, sometimes yelling, lots of memos, phone calls, more yelling. The key is don’t
play by the seat of your pants. The more time you give people to respond the better it is.

It's always the contention with academics and the university, we try to get students in, sometimes they look at bodies and we look at qualities. Bodies means money, positions. We might see special programs that we see in the marketing area, we might have to communicate with them, this program is bogus, possibly with the business office or with financial aid. If the head of the department wants a valedictorian, or if financial aid doesn't want to play games.

The major emphasis [for our funding] or market is the five state area and Colorado. Those are the strong areas for finances. The majority of alumns are there - TX, LS, OK, AK, NM. [Our] outside [funding sources are], the individual churches, [they] send the bulk of [our] money, the alumni.

The staff people report trends, communicate internally, our college is viewed well. We seem to do the right things.

We have staff manuals, each person has pet peeves. The Presidents pet peeve is to have no surprises. Mine is don't talk behind my back. I give one warning. The rules apply with the manuals. When I hire someone I tell them here's a manual, here's what I expect. My media assistant is leaving, it takes a while to go through the procedures.

[Our benefit package here is] very good. The Blue Cross/Blue Shield insurance I don't like. We're switching to
Travelor's. The college takes good care of us, [and we have a] retirement fund.

The college pays for any additional school with approval of the president or from me or my department and needs to benefit the whole structure.

[Our] informal groups are staff, [we celebrate] anniversaries, birthdays. [Our] informal groups get along, that helps. Not mandatory that they come. There is no pressure when we get together. Staff people go to lunch, eat together in the cafeteria.

They know that I am a highly motivated person. They try to slow me down. Hey Mark, have you forgotten that you have a family, they become protective. The President said [on my last evaluation] you need to cut back. [It is really] fun [to work here as well as] challenging.

[There is some] gossip, good communication in events. Sometimes the breakdown in communication is in procedure. There is gossip over coffee, or going into each others office. There isn't a normal channel, if someone's mad it depends on who's around in an informal situation.

The majority of decisions are made [and] approved by the president. [I am] totally [responsible for the decisions affecting my work and to that same extent when my supervisor consults me when there are decisions to be made that affect me, as well as].
The really influential people in my unit are the president, the administration assistant (the assistant to the president). [The] president [controls what goes on in the organization]. [To get ahead] work hard [and] do the job. [The rewards are] merit raises, personal satisfaction. [If there is disagreement in the unit and] if they can’t work with themselves, I step in or [if I have to discuss it with the president then] what the President says goes.

[I am] very [satisfied with my job]. [Especially] when things go right, students are doing well, the students overall achieve.

[I am least satisfied with] the size of the student body restrictions. It’s the politics of education. I mean why doesn’t the University of North Texas work with Texas Women’s University. You can’t say you are a graduate of UNT and you are superior to someone. The majority of students are on a freshman-level. We had one person with a Master’s degree and a Ph.d. who needed to re-take Beginning English. One guy had two Ph.d’s in Communication. You might look at our university and say we’re a small student body so it doesn’t count. People who get hurt are not our graduates they are the the people at UNT who don’t have quality students - look at the the pedigree - not who you are, but what you are. They politicize the system, from kinder up. Kids gets burned in this.
Students get [a] quality education [here] in a quality environment. You see what the student really needs. You have to make sure you have the right people, not [one's] predominately concerned with themselves, [people] who have academic solidity and put input in peoples' lives. A high standing in education is maintained [here]. [Working here is] fun-intense-diversified! If a person is used to factory assembly work they would not like this job.

[Our institution is] Christian, conservative. There was a day of mourning yesterday when Clinton won. Socially, we are diversified. Morally, to the right. We look at the quality, costs, speed, quantity, innovation.

I take risks and I stick my neck out. [One of our major successes is] the inner city thing. It had gone from nothing to volunteering for different areas, working with consistent bases with relations with children, that no one else is doing.

I don't dwell on failures. Recently, we had some solid staff people who were stolen away. Things are done on time. Routine works well without shaking up the world. Policies, job descriptions, smoothing out coordination of people working together. It has taken ten years. It takes time to get the right chemistry, right now the Dallas Cowboys have the right chemistry, Herschel Walker and then Emmitt Smith came along. I'm a people person, good with PR, not good with super detailed. If I'm going to be the head of the department then I need to coordinate people, get around more detailed people.
I could say interview for so long and that's it. My assistant might call in and she might say what's going on. Lots of the time I frustrate my assistant.

I don't wait till something is broken to fix it. I'm not highly concerned with retention. Two or three years we'll have problems, see if we saturate the primary market.

[Our main strength in our unit is] teamwork!
[Our strenght of the organization as a whole] honestly, I think it's a Christian atmosphere. [Our main problem is] to forget we're Christians, [and when we fail in our] communication.

[The main problems in our unit is] to save money on staff is cliche. There are morals and values in school which are a problem. [In the unit in most need of change is] to add staff that has left. My assistant is leaving. I don't want to go backwards from where we came. [In the organization as a whole, we need some] refinement, constantly [as] a time vehicle.
I was born and reared in Sherman, Tx-attended public schools and high school, graduated there-attended and graduated from the University of North Texas, in those days North Texas State Teachers College-with a BS in Sociology and then graduated from the Dallas Theological Seminary with a Masters of theology-degree, I have a MA degree in pastoral counseling from Phillips University from Phillips University in Enid Ok and a ME from the University of Ok at Norman and a Dr. of ministry degree from the graduate seminary at Phillips University in Enid Ok-those are my academic credentials.

I am both VP of Student Services and Dean of Students-as VP of student services that mean that I direct and oversee first of all the work of counseling services-secondly I direct or oversee the work of our chaplain or the chaplain program-then of course my staff includes an advisory to international students, an associate dean of students, an assistant dean of students-I am advisor to groups on campus like the student government, advisor to the campus newspaper, I'm a member of the Executive Committee of the seminary-I am a member of innumerable other committees that meet here and those would be the principle responsibilities.
I have served at one time for several years on the seminary's Board of Regents and Board of Incorporate Members and I have not worked for the seminary in any other capacity. The other position of course is a voluntary position, it's not an employed position-16 years. We are really charged generally with the phrase, "the spiritual and emotional and social development of students"-that's the broad category that encompasses here at this time, regular chapel program, counseling services program and then the usual responsibilities connected with deans, associate deans, the deans offices. I do not work outside with any persons outside the seminary. So, I do not have to work outside the seminary with any individuals or organizations-inside the seminary of course I work with the different staff of our department-secondly I also work with the other VP's of the seminary-I work with the President of the seminary-those would be the major persons with whom I work regularly and as a schedule, of course I at times work with individual faculty or individual staff but those are not scheduled regular responsibilities like those with the persons that I have already mentioned. I communicate with them both by regularly scheduled one on one individual meetings-secondly by written memo, and thirdly by telephone and finally by informal meetings and additionally by staff by group meetings, not only regularly scheduled meetings individually but regularly scheduled meetings with them as
staff or as Executive Committee-or as departmental staff meetings.

The kinds of problems that I handle at work are first of all administrative, that is developing those kinds of programs that we feel are needed to contribute to student development—so there are those administrative and supervisory responsibilities connected with developing programs and activities—there are then there are the problems of coordination and communication that go on between our department and other departments of the seminary—I deal with problems with policy, not with policy but with implementation of policy as a member of the Executive Committee for the seminary as a whole, and finally I deal with the problems of the students, both those who come to me with various kinds of either concerns or some kinds of complaints or needs or sometimes meeting with individual students in terms of our concerns with them.

[When problems occur] mostly we would deal with it (as a broad generalization) in sitting down and talking with persons face to face, mostly face to face to discuss what is the concern or try to understand the nature of the concern is and then having tried to come to some understanding of whatever concern the problem there is and then to problem solving and
then together to see if we can't find satisfactory and an answer that all of us agree to.

I suppose the unexpected situations would be mostly with the problems that students individually may have-obviously most problems students have fall into some expected category but it's not possible to anticipate when those will occur with students, so I will say that the major unanticipated problems we deal with would be student concerns, a concern that a student may have, or occasionally some unanticipated problem with student behavior.

[The largest barrier is] the barrier of sufficient funding, budgeting, and tended to that would of course be the ability to employ, hire staff who would assist in carrying out a lot of those functions-I think that that would probably be the major barrier that I would experience.

Within the student services-the work is coordinated through a weekly staff meeting-two (2) hour staff meetings each week where all of the staff members ahead of time enter items on an agenda-for discussion that they wish to either get action on or to communicate in terms of information given-secondly through regularly scheduled meetings between me and each person on the staff-and then beyond that the written communication that goes on and informal meetings.
[Our] goals and objectives are spelled out—they have been spelled out first of all in a document we have called vision 2000—that includes both long term objectives in terms of the next 10 years—they have been adopted by, they have been proposed and adopted by our staff working together as a staff and then those goals and objectives have been broken down into a timeline—those that we expect to achieve within the year we break down into annual objectives and then other timeline leading into the ten year vision 2000.

[How I know when I have done a job well are by] the normal things that primarily [are] through feedback received from other staff persons, from the president of the school, from the Executive Committee, from other staff members, from the both written and verbal commendation that is given for jobs and general work—in terms of goals—through the regular discussion our whole staff in our scheduled meetings, progress on the goals, whether the staff agrees that they have been achieved—often that involves evaluation by students, we often seek in many goals statements of evaluation from students through interviews as well as surveys.

We have to work with the faculty as a faculty and individually what other units we have to work with here meaning student services as a unit—we have to work with the Executive Committee and with the president of the seminary.
[Contacts with other units] are coordinated by meetings between us and them as called as needed-they are, coordination also goes on through written memos, and also coordination through the regular meetings of the seminary’s cabinet and Executive Committee.

We get funds through annual budgeting and we-if their is a felt need for funds beyond the budgeted items then we get that through the process of going through the seminary’s Executive Committee-for that materials we order through our seminary’s sources-through the seminary’s purchasing department and other sources of materials here by written memo by ordering processes-persons, support by housekeeping, support by building and grounds-those kinds of people we get directly by communicating with those departments.

[Our relations with other units are] mostly smooth and-mostly trouble free. That always has to be qualified, there are always times of insufficient information and a break down of communication, but I would think I would have to describe it as smooth. We do not have contact with external groups and organizations. Fields or other areas we have to work in as far as Student Services are concerned rather than Dallas Seminary as an institution-in connection with Student Services at the Dallas Seminary, we do not have to work with [or in] competition with any other fields or areas.
In the Seminary at large—they need to receive continually budgetary information and they receive that principally through me at the weekly staff meetings or as they request that information they also receive it at times if they wish to receive it through the Seminary’s controller—they have access to contacting the Seminary’s controller for financial information directly, but on a regular basis that information that they normally wish may come through me—or again to repeat what I have said, they often go through the Seminary’s controller, so they need budgetary and financial information, they need information about policies that are related to support activities of housing or building of grounds—they can get that information directly through contacting those departments—they at times may need demographic information and they get that by contacting the Registrar’s office—they may need information about academic scheduling of courses or other academic and they get that by contacting through the Academic Dean’s office—I believe those would be the large areas that they would need information about and the ways of going about getting it.

I would think that information and service, are the two largest areas that we depend on other’s for. We would be most dependent on, for services from what we call our facilities, our shop and housing area where we need housekeeping, set-up
of rooms, set-up of equipment, arrangement of special events or set-up of area for special events.

We really don't deal with external groups—very much—perhaps I do need to qualify that—we do at times arrange for some external groups to have presentations for students or meet with students so we do meet with some external Christian organizations, external organizations who do meet with students or make presentations to students. What challenges we have are challenges with those and—not really any, we have not really had any challenges with those external organizations.

I am the head of this unit—and I report directly to both the president as well as to the Executive Committee of the Seminary, so the organizational chart here has the Seminary's president at the top and beneath him four vice presidents and I am one of the four vice presidents—we report to him directly but the four vice presidents and the president constitute the Executive Committee, so our organizational flow is directed both to our president and to that Executive Committee—Reporting to me are Director of Counseling Services, a chaplain, an advisor to international students, an associate dean, assistant dean, a president of the student council, a vice president of the Student Council.
We all operate under both a faculty handbook and a staff handbook, and those—we all operate under the authority of a faculty and a staff handbook—we have departmental policies and they relate to a work schedule, to procedures relating to staff meetings—those would be the major departmental policies. They seem to work quite well. The Seminary has a retirement program or plan which exists in written form and is spelled out in some detail—so in terms of retirement there is an official plan—there is an official health policy, the Seminary has a health policy for all our faculty and staff and also provides a, requires students to carry a health program and provides a group program at a very low cost program to students in health care-directly. The staff and faculty may audit or may enroll in courses on campus, first of all—and there is some assistance, there is special rates and costs available to that—the Seminary also assists financially faculty who do study at other institution, there is financial assistance in terms of scholarship and assistance financially for that.

I think that all of the groups I am aware of would be formal in terms of faculty, departments of the faculty, faculty per se—there is an informal group among the women employees—that, there are informal groups for students and student spouses, but informal groups for staff or faculty at large, I don’t think there are any. We have some informal
groups], we have some athletic groups, we have a co-ed, this is for students, we have a co-ed volleyball team, we have a basketball team, these are student groups. There are really very few informal groups—I am not a part of any of those groups, and there have not been any conflicts [here] which I have been a part of.

[We are members of a health club] our students all hold membership as a part of student fee—students who are enrolled for six or more hours pay a small student fee which gives them membership at the Baylor Fitness Center and at the Landry, I think it is the Landry Sports Health Service Center.

The president of the Seminary [is my supervisor]. [I work] fairly closely, we have a regularly scheduled meeting every week—just one on one—I have complete access to him at any time—I feel free to call him, to write him, or to go in and meet with him at any time I desire to do so. He’s a very-supportive person—very good listener—very much for the work of Student Services—those terms I think all but describe the relationship.

We, the other people in our unit, meaning Student Services, are very compatible group of people—they all seem to express the feeling that they enjoy working together—and seem to share the same perspectives and approaches. In the unit,
they find out-first of all, through the weekly meetings that
our unit has-and secondly, of course through individual
meetings weekly, there is a twice a month campus paper that
communicates information generally-there is also a twice a
month paper that's just primarily an information paper-to the
campus at large, there are chapel, there's a weekly staff
chapel meeting which also communicates information, and there-
the staff and faculty receive information both by written memo
and sent printed memo as well as through computer "e" mail.

In our unit, decision(s) would be made almost totally by
the staff who meet in the weekly meetings-I think that
probably, the only decisions that are not made there are
decisions that would be made at the board, decisions that are
made at the Seminary's board level, occasionally at the
Seminary's executive committee level, the decisions that
relate just to the department are made by the staff meeting
together. Almost all the decisions affecting my work are
made-either by me or in consultation with me.

The really all-of-it might be difficult to single out a
person, my administrative assistant-our, one of our associate
dean, our chaplain-probably are among the more influential
people [here]. The organization as a whole, the Seminary as
a whole, the Seminary's board of trustees, the Seminary's
incorporated, board of incorporate members and regents, in
other words the boards, the Seminary’s boards-set policy and they really do establish policies for the Seminary, at an administrative level, below the boards, the Seminary’s executive committee establishes administrative policies and determines what goes on, the Seminary’s faculty-determine under the, determine academic issues.

[To get ahead you] participate in appropriate committees and boards-if one’s faculty one really needs to attend faculty meetings, serve on the committees which are, to which faculty is appointed if one’s on staff, the same thing with staff meetings and participate in staff committee meetings-those would be I think the principle ways one would get ahead.

Of course the [rewards are] awards of commendation from supervisors, in my case the commendation written and verbal from the president and I think in other departments the same experience is true, that there seems to be a good amount of commending people for work well done, a students seem to, there seems to be a significant amount of appreciation expressed by students, both the faculty and staff for what they think to be good experiences-I think that peers, faculty and staff peers, there is an, annually staff appreciation time, in which the staff who have served for five years, ten years are honored, given gifts-there is a monthly report given by the president to-both to faculty and staff in printed staff
and to board in which people are acknowledged, and what has been accomplished by individuals is acknowledged in a written report from the president to the faculty, to the staff and to the boards, I think that those are some of the rewards—that are received here—of course pay. Well the printed [awards] that I mentioned particularly refers to the report that the president gives in which from every department individuals who have accomplished or achieved are—even personal things are mentioned by name, specifically and by name—secondly it’s a, I think a very widespread practice that the president and all his supervisors send frequent written personal commendations for tasks and accomplishments—annually for staff there is a dinner, a appreciation dinner, and similarly they are recognized annually during a staff appreciation meeting during the day on campus, there are special events that are kind of in honor, are in honor of a special Christmas event, and some special events like that—there are birthdays. almost all departments have special birthday celebrations—in the department with refreshments honoring members of the department, that’s inclusive of both the staff and the faculty.

[Disagreements] I think are resolved almost totally by meetings between the individuals—meeting together and sitting down together face to face, occasionally they may be resolved through the supervisors of those individuals who talk at the
supervisory level, but mostly they seem to be resolved at the direct level of individuals.

I am very pleased with working here. The work that I do, the people that I, the fact that I am working with people who are preparing for a life's vocation and life's service is probably, that's probably the greatest satisfaction that we're working with men and women who are preparing for a lifes vocation-I would say very near to that are the people with whom I work, that is staff and the president and other administrative people.

The budget constraints that limit our ability to do a lot of important things, including personal and professional development, we're limited by those budgetary restraints, that would I think really be probably the major thing that I am dissatisfied with.

The organization has a stated organizational purpose which I can not cite verbatim precisely but I can cite pretty closely, which is to prepare men and women to be godly servant leaders, serving the church and serving the world through various means and that is the institutions purpose. [To] pursues its mission, of course first of all academic training, training men and women in academic skills, secondly by trying
to develop men and women where students in the character areas and then in the skills area of our field.

I would describe the atmosphere at work as being very active, very challenging because of the great amount of interaction with students—and the, both the challenge of that as well as the pleasure of that, I would describe it as being very-enjoyable, very stimulating, mentally stimulating—I think those would probably be terms that I would use.

Theologically [our] norms would be described by terms like conservative and evangelical, Christian-beliefs biblically focused or oriented beliefs, norms that deal with being thoughtful—with being-considerate or courteous—of being the norms of being—of quality and excellence, excellence in what one does and quality. Quality and excellence would be most emphasized here.

To some degree I do, mistakes are not, if I can elaborate on that, mistakes are not condemned, there seems to be a good acceptance of failure or of mistakes—probably, especially if those are made within the boundaries of where the school stands with its values.

I think that establishing a relationship with the-Baylor Fitness Center and the Tom Landry Sports Medicine Center is
one of our successes—I would say that another one of our successes has been the establishing of continuing orientation through the year for entering students as an ongoing program there have been others.

We have first of all, of course, a one day orientation but then the entering class at our school have monthly class meetings—at which probably 60% or 70% of them who are in class normally are in attendance and the four times a year at those class meetings we have the opportunity to do ongoing, continuing orientation using faculty and other resources to try to accomplish things that we would like to accomplish, time management, for example, emphasizing and training in time management, in research and writing, character development, some areas like that. We would talk a lot about integrity in character development and that would relate to integrity, since we’re on an honor system here—deal with plagiarism, with areas like plagiarism in work—would deal with keeping ones appointments, those are some of the areas that quickly come to mind.

The things that I would mention are not so much failures, they are things that didn’t really work, we—for example, we have had to scale back our exit interviews with students, graduating students, principally because of the limitations of staff and so in a sense it’s not a failure so much as a
necessity to cut back when we couldn’t fulfill a goal, budgetary constraints have required us to cut back in our counseling services on staff—and so those I do not view as failures—in the usual sense of the word.

I think [our unit] is operating effectively—but that does not imply that we are not aware of large areas where we have goals and are seeking to develop change, working effectively does not mean that we are doing all of the things that we want to do and need to do, what it does mean, but I think it means that we’re working effectively, meaning that we are setting goals regularly and we are meeting those goals and we are achieving many of those goals that we set, we experience a great amount of compatibility among our staff who there is a large degree of satisfaction among our personnel and staff—so I would say that the two things the large amount of what seems to be satisfaction on the part of staff and secondly the fact that staff together are setting goals and achieving many of those indicates effectiveness to me.

I have been here just four years so I can’t really comment very well how things have changed since the unit got started—but since when I joined this staff four years ago, have probably been in the way that the staff operates—there were not regularly scheduled staff meetings at the time that I came—meetings were held only as called or needed, so called
needed, as need arose, so there seem to, I am told that there was a felt need on the part of a lot of staff of not having sufficient communication and information giving, and not enough—meeting together to, decision making was not done by the staff therefore as a group at that time, so I think that one of the major changes that has occurred has been in the way the staff operated in the last four years.

In the four years that I have been here, there have not been large changes in the way that we operate, the institution of or the inauguration of an executive committee was begun I believe just about a year prior to my joining the staff, and I was the fourth member of that committee to, of that executive committee to come on, so that has continued to be one of the functions, I think that the faculty have reorganized, whereas years past there was a faculty senate who met to carry on a lot of functions, there is a different kind of faculty mechanism for working between full faculty meetings and I’m not acquainted with that since that’s not my area—but campus wide I think that the present system has been in place about four or five years and that has not changed significantly.

I think facing our organization, meaning the Seminary, the major challenges facing us, will be both in recruitment and retention students and in fund raising, advancements—
increasing the gifts, and increasing endowment, increasing the funding of the Seminary and scholarship, increasing the scholarship aid to students, which partly answers the question you asked, how are we going to achieve the goals, which are recruitment, retention, I think one large part of that will be increasing scholarship aid, for students so that more students who are qualified can afford to be here and to stay here and to study here.

I think the main strengths of our unit really are it's personnel, the people who are in the positions that they are in. I, first of all, I think the same strength, I think the staff, the personnel and faculty and staff, the quality of people and the persons themselves are one of the main strengths, I think secondly probably the commitment of the governing board of the Seminary, very high quality and committed group of board members who, is another great strength of the seminary, constituency, I think that the Seminary has a rather large and committed group of constituents.

The main problems in the unit, unit meaning Student Services, I think come back again to first of all to budgetary constraints is probably the main problem that we have. The main problems would be [for the entire organization] there again [would be] budgetary problems and that relates partly to
a second problem which is ability to recruit and retain students—it’s not a problem in the sense, it’s a problem in the sense of a challenge and a need for people doing that— and the budgetary constraints just underlie a lot of the challenges of our institution.

In our unit, meaning Student Services—the main things that we would probably need to change would be to expand our staff a little bit when we are able to do that in terms of budget—particularly to expand our staff in counseling services area—I would see that as our main need. The second need would be to expand our staff in terms of staffing for international students, we have a significant number of international students who really need a lot of student services, supplied them and-budgetary constraints have limited our staff for international students. The Seminary campus wide—probably the main thing that may need change campus wide in addition to the things that I have already mentioned which are budgetary advancement, funding—ways of doing that better, but probably beyond that greatest need for change would be to create structure by which the faculty would have more time for social interaction.
I was born September 4, 1955 in Florida and for the most part from 1963 until now have lived here in the Dallas area. I did a bachelor's degree, well I did an associate's degree, two year associate's degree at Southern Baptist College in Arkansas and then left there and came back to Dallas and finished my bachelor's degree at Dallas Baptist College. Stayed there and did a master's degree and graduated with that in '86 and travelled to Scotland where I lived for 3 years and did my Ph.D. work. All of it relating in one way or another to either biblical studies or pastoral ministries.

First and foremost, I am a professor. And as such, I teach New Testament studies, and I also chair the New Testament Department. As an administrator, I am the director of Student Affairs, which means that everything pertaining to student life, except the academic curriculum itself, comes under the purview of my office.

I am Professor of New Testament and Director of Student Affairs. I was originally hired as Professor of New Testament and was only this past July was asked to assume the responsibilities of student affairs, so originally it
was strictly and only professor, now it's both professor and administrator for student affairs. In the academic end, the New Testament Department and the administrative end, Student Affairs. The Student Affairs end of things, we have a student council here at the school. The student council is made up of the officers, student council officers, and then representatives of each class: freshman class, sophomore class, junior class, etc.; and also since we offer graduate degrees here, we have graduate representatives. It is my office's job to work with them closely in planning activities for the student body throughout the year, for coordinating these activities, overseeing the budget for these activities and such as that. So I work very closely with the student council and, in fact, probably as much if not more so in an advisory way to student council with regard to student activities. Perhaps a little more formally, it is my office, serves as the liaison, you might say, between the student body and the administration of the school, so that any complaints or problems that arise with a student, my office is the first line of recourse that the students would have, coming through my office. So I field all of those complaints and problems and such as that, or suggestions, anytime the students have suggestions, and we try and facilitate this communication as much as possible by keeping very open policy with regard to our students. They know they can come and go, pretty much as they need to, and there
is a great deal of access directly to me, in fact. They do not have to go through my secretary if I am in. They can come directly to my office and knock on my door. If I am not in, my secretary usually will have an idea of what my schedule is and make every available opportunity to them for access to me. So we just try to facilitate an open door policy in terms of communication with the student council proper and with the student body in general. And then we have a student affairs committee which helps me. This is made up usually of two or three colleagues, usually these are faculty members but sometimes there's one administrator on it who does not actively teach and also usually there is a member on the student affairs committee who is the representative with the student wives fellowship. We try and involve the overall family of the students and so normally we have student wives association or student wives fellowship and one of the faculty wives or administrator wives will serve as the faculty representative or liaison to help that group also. And they would also usually be on the student affairs committee. This committee helps set policy for student activities, helps with disciplinary problems when the arise and such as that. So those are the basic ways, basic tasks, that we perform and the means and personnel we, and structure, we have in terms of trying to accomplish this.

Primarily we work with the student council and they, as
I said, they serve to be a bridge, you might say, between the administration of the school and the faculty of the school and the student body. I work very closely with the student council. In addition to the student council, at our school we have what are called advisor groups. Every faculty member who either is full-time faculty member or is in what we might call an intermediate stage of employment, they do more for us than a normal adjunct professor, they teach more than one course, they have committee assignments and such as that, yet they are not, they do not have full faculty status yet, some of those also serve as advisors, but every faculty member, and some of these in the intermediate category, serves as an advisor. That means that we divide the student body up and assign each student to a faculty advisor. This faculty advisor is to function in two ways, and this is a group that I consider of extreme importance for accomplishing the tasks of this office, as well as for giving the students an extra level of education and exposure to professors and faculty that they might not get without this sort of arrangement. The advisor is to function really in two ways to every student in their advisor group, and by the way our advisor groups normally number about 24 per professor, even though our faculty/student ratio is lower than that because we have adjuncts who don’t function as advisors. But each advisor is to function first in a technical sense to advise each
student on their academic program. If a student has decisions to make concerning which course would be better for their particular studies and their major, their interests and such as that, or if they have a scheduling conflict and we have to substitute a course which is not originally a part of their program, but because of a scheduling conflict we have to make substitutions or allow independent study or something, their advisor is the one who they turn to first for those kinds of things. But, more pertinent to our discussion today, the advisor, and this is written up in our student handbook as such, the advisor is to function as what we call sort of a second pastor, a counselor, a guide, a mentor to the students. And, in that way, they are to build an informal bridge, you might say, between themselves and the student. They are to try and integrate into the academic and educational experience a relational level that we think rounds off in the most appropriate way the educational experience, and in doing that they are encouraged to have students in their homes from time to time throughout the year. They are encouraged to meet with each student one on one at least once through the semester. A lot of times students can't come to the faculty advisor meetings which are held once every other Wednesday, or every other Wednesday I should say, twice a month. So those that can't come to those meetings because they may not be on campus on Wednesday's, they are
encouraged to contact them personally. So all of these sorts of things help us very much in encouraging and guiding the students through their educational time here at the school. My office also oversees the advisors, so I work closely with them with this purpose in mind. I make suggestions as to what kinds of things would be appropriate to do during the advisor meetings. How to handle various problems, if problems of academic probation arise, if problems of if ethical problems arise within a student’s life, such as that, then my office, myself and, if needed the student affairs committee, becomes involved and advises the advisor as to how to deal with the student. So I work very closely with the student council and the student advisors. As far as how we communicate among ourselves, oh one other person, we have a student council representative from the faculty, and so he and myself also work closely together and communicate quite extensively on what needs to be done for the students, the student body. As far as how we communicate, we have faculty meetings, usually have a time set aside for me to speak to the faculty in their roles as advisors, and so that is probably the most formal means of communication. Beyond that it is a matter of putting out memos as needed, or calling special called meetings between myself and the advisors or the student council. Our faculty representative to the student council usually sits in on every one of the student council meetings, so we at least
have faculty member, under the purview of my office, involved in those as well. And then about once a month I try to meet with the student council members. So it's, most of it is on a, I guess what you might say is an ad hoc basis, for the most part.

I think to be quite honest, most of the problems that I encounter and that most of us encounter, concern counseling students with regard to the difficulties they are facing outside school life. Most of our students are involved in one way or another in some sort of local community activity. Because we are a school whose main purpose is the training of Christian ministers and that includes degrees toward that involving counseling, evangelism and missions, as well as pastoral ministries, then most of our students are involved in some sort of community activity or local church work or something like that outside of school, and most of the difficulties and problems we encounter here at the school that involve counseling students with regard to the things they encounter there. It's not unusual at all for me to meet with 2 or 3 students a week and discuss issues of child abuse, sexual abuse in one way or another, or alcoholism and the problems associated with that in the lives of people they're working with on a community basis outside of school, and the students are not far enough along in their ministry training yet to know how to deal with those. So most of the problems I would encounter actually concern things outside
of school life. In terms of internal problems, this semester I have encountered difficulties concerning academic probation students who for one reason or another are not making the grade, so to speak, academically. And so I have to meet with these students and see if there is a problem that we can help them work through. As needed, I issue formal warnings because we have certain policies that, if the student doesn't make the grade for a certain length of time, they're issued a warning. If they don't bring it up within the warning or probationary period, then they are dismissed from our school. And then also this semester, I have dealt with and encountered ethical problems, problems of immorality among our students, and have had to try and deal with these. It especially at this point when the Student Affairs Committee becomes involved, and I at that point do nothing that would be or could be construed as personal policy but instead involves the committee so that it clearly is being carried out in a way which is in accordance with the overall policies of the school, itself. But most of our problems, I must admit, are difficulties of things the students encounter outside of our school and therefore they come to us for counsel on how to deal with it. And then of course there are just the typical scheduling problems and financial problems that normal students face that they need counsel and guidance in one way or another to help them see their way through them.
Well, the first thing I do [when problems occur], and we encourage all our advisors to do, so whether it's me personally or someone else responding to a problem on the basis of guidance I have given them, another faculty member or colleague or whatever, responding to a problem that I am aware of and have advised them on but allowed them to take care of. We encourage very strongly, in each instance, to first and foremost be a listener and try and get to the root of, or get a better sense, I should say, of what exactly the problem involves. That seems to be something that should be obvious, that it could remain unstated, but none the less we're also pressed for time, that either we will forget it or let it slip or just not be sensitive to the need to do that to begin with. So, we certainly emphasize getting as full a picture of the problem as you can, right up front, and then allowing the student to express their own concerns, their own fears about the problem, their own understanding of why they may be encountering this problem at the time. In other words, try and allow the student to have his or her own input at every level, as possible. So once we have done that, we handle the problem, I think, in two ways, well perhaps we say three ways. One is, we approach every problem with the presupposition that the scriptures give us the guidance that's needed to work through all of our problems. It gives us the principles, it being the scripture, it gives us the principles by which we should
approach virtually any problem we encounter. And so the first thing we try and do is to lead the students to an understanding of how do the scriptures relate to this problem. Where can we see the relevancy of the bible to this particular issue. What does the bible have to say concerning this, and how do those principles or those truths relate to my current situation. And then secondly, we also approach each problem with the presupposition that the reality and presence of God in our lives makes all the difference in the world and that, if we will but humbly pray for His strength and guidance, we will find that, at the time find it explicitly through His words, scriptures, but in other ways as well. So therefore, we try and lead the student to a point of seeing that they are not in these problems alone. Even if they get the impression that we don’t care, try and lead them to see that our personal Heavenly Father cares and He will help them see their way through this. So, we nearly always pray with the students. That is not just sort of a token prayer, but we really try and emphasize the personal aspect of it. And then thirdly, we always try and follow up personally on virtually every problem. In other words, it’s one thing to come in and get counsel and then be sent on your way. It’s another thing to be followed up on by your advisor or my office or whatever to see if everything is working out better, to see if there is anything further that we can do, anything practical, just
exactly how things are working out, if something else needs to be done on our part, if different counsel needs to be given or whatever the case might be. So, I think those are the three levels that we try to work out these problems on the basis of.

The variations and unexpected situations that occur are the unexpected situations. I guess the thing that would be most unexpected to me, and to most of us here, would be the degree to which the same or similar problems that occur in what we would call a secular organization also occur in our organization, which is as I have noted a Christian organization attempting to live by Christian standards. And yet we continue to find that there are abusive situations occurring, situations of immorality, ethical problems that you normally wouldn't expect but yet seem to still occur, oftentimes, in our organization. I think that would be the most unexpected thing.

Well, one thing that would perhaps be a variation, to some extent, is there have been a couple of times when we have had to directly involve people from outside the school in a problem because it just could not be addressed adequately internally, only. For example, just recently I had to call in both a parent and a pastor of a local church in which one of our students was a member because of a situation that had arisen and just could not be dealt with adequately internally, and of necessity had to involve those
other parties. Actually, that problem remains unresolved at the time, so it is probably the situation that has been most unusual thus far. The reason it remains unresolved is because the student has, evidently, decide that they would break off all contact totally with us, and so we are left, you might say, unable to do anything with regard to that one because the student has quit coming to school and has just broken off all contact, not only with us, but also with the parents, I might add, and the former pastor. So I guess the variations would be when we have to go, specifically have to go outside the institution and involve people from outside in one way or another.

[Barriers] first and foremost would probably be time. The faculty and administration is stretched quite thin, for various reasons. And therefore we just do not have, even though we have a low student/faculty ratio, we still none the less do not have the personnel needed to oversee these kinds of matters to the degree that they probably merit. And so, probably the first barrier or difficulty would be time. One reason why we don’t have the personnel is of course money. Not enough financial backing to be able to see our way through to more personnel. Then I guess if there was a third one, it would perhaps be, and by no means am I trying to force responsibility off on anyone else, but just lack of taking advisor roles seriously from the advisor’s perspective and the lack of taking the advisor
role seriously from the student's perspective. Many students, parents, and faculty members think of that relationship, I think, to lightly and therefore it does not make the kind of contribution to the life of the student that it should and that we desire.

Most of the work is, since of course the unit is rather small, there's not a lot of coordination that needs to be done, other than between myself and the advisors. That role is pretty much the same sort of thing throughout the year, so there's not a lot of coordination that goes on there. It's more a matter of exhorting them to do what they know they ought to do. In terms of the student council and the faculty representative to the student council, they meet with me, in one way or another, about once a month. Our school is small enough that I see each of them in the hallways regularly and frequently, and that enables me to do a lot of things somewhat informally, and as needed basis, instead of meeting formally at regularly scheduled intervals, none the less we do meet, as I said, about once a month. And then, just between myself and my secretary, we make sure that all communication and all events and such as that are coordinated and communicated as needed.

Evaluations, there actually aren't any right now, other than whether or not the natives get restless. As far as the budget that would involve our business and administrative
office. We do have a budget. I am the one primarily responsible for overseeing that budget and making sure that, first of all of course, we do not go over budget and, secondly, trying to make sure the budget monies are spent in the most propitious and effective way possible. We actually allow the student council to have the majority of the say so as to how the budget is spent. In other words, we have a student activities fund and in that student activities fund, or I shouldn’t say in it, the majority of it is specifically set aside for just exactly that, activities with and for the student, and so therefore we allow them to have the main input into the kinds of activities they would like to have. We do have some traditional things that are part of it, but outside the traditional things it’s really up to them, subject to my office’s approval. Beyond the student activities, there are other monies that are budgeted and they are strictly up to my discretion as to what is needed. For example the student handbook, my office is responsible for putting that together. That is not part of the student activities budget, so these sorts of things are evaluated annually, simply as they are used. Do they actually represent what is in fact the policy of the school? And of course each of the policies are subject to review and revision on an as needed basis, so all the other budgets and evaluations and such as that are, again, more ad hoc than anything else.
I will be the first to admit that I am not a professional administrator. One of the reasons I have this job is because, again, we are a small institution and many of us, or some of us I should say, have to wear more than one hat. So, I think that the reason I was asked to take this position is because the administration regarded me as someone the students always felt like they could be open with, and yet they respected at the same time, which they were looking for a particular relationship with the students for this office, more than they were looking for administrative competency, necessarily. So my administrative or management method is good old common sense, probably.

I have a job description for this unit and mainly, again since we are so small, the unit would be primarily my office and anyone else needed or on an as needed basis. And the job description would basically state the goals and objectives and so they are directed more at me and the one holding the position that I hold more so than any sort of overall unit. As the institution grows, of course, that would need to be reevaluated, but for right now it's a pretty personal and individualistic sort of thing.

As far as our teaching goes, we have student and peer evaluations, but as far as the administrative end, which is been almost exclusively what I've been discussing because that's what relates to the student's affairs of the school
in a more general sense. It's more, I think, more a matter of making sure that we understand what the objectives and goals are of my office in general, which as I've stated is contained in the job descriptions and responsibilities, and then secondly the goals and objectives for specific tasks or activities throughout the year, and then the kind of feedback we get on the basis of those individual ones. In terms of my office in general, I am part of the academic cabinet or administrative cabinet of the school, and therefore the tasks that my office performs are continually subject to scrutiny and review in there. That is lead by our vice-president for academic affairs and is comprised of he and, I think, four other administrators at the school, so we all are sort of almost a college, if you will, and are continually able to and encouraged to give one another input with regard to one another's responsibilities and jobs. Again, because we are such a small school, and nearly each administrative section is comprised really of just one person, usually, then that kind of feedback, that kind of exchange and interchange of ideas and of scrutiny and such as that is healthy and important. And so, I think it would be a matter of the personal feedback that I get, whether it be via the academic cabinet or whether it be through the student body itself, because there is a lot of communication that goes on both of those levels.

Each of those units that I just mentioned, that
comprise the academic cabinet is chaired by our vice-

president of academic affairs, or vice-president for
academic affairs, and in addition to he and myself, there
would be the director of alumni affairs, and of course there
is a fine line between student affairs and alumni affairs.
And there would then be the academic dean, who would be very
much involved, of course, with regard to any academic
problems I have to work through. There would then be the
registrar, director of admissions and registrar, who would
be involved on various sorts of levels as I work through
problems or try and accomplish tasks, and I think that may
be all on the academic cabinet. So it would be those five
men, and those would be the ones I primarily work with.

The academic cabinet meet(s) once a month,
year-round, since each member of the academic cabinet is an
administrator they would have some obligation year-round, so
we would meet once a month. And via those formal meetings
and the agendas and such as that of those meetings, most of
the coordination would be effective through those avenues.
I also have virtually unlimited access, each of us on that
cabinet would, in fact nearly the whole faculty, would have
virtually unlimited access to any other administrator right
on up to the president of the institution. And, that can be
coordinated as needed through any other office with a great
deal of openness and freedom and availability, but primarily
through the academic cabinet.
[The kinds of things our unit needs to get from other units, such as funds, approval for action, materials, people, information] primarily would involve financing, I think.

Student affairs doesn't involve, or does not need, as much from other units besides the administrative and business office nearly as much as they need us. I'm called upon by the academic end administration and the alumni end of the administration and such as that, probably more often than we call on them, except, as I said, with regard to the business office who allocates funds and the administrative office, who also is involved in allocating of funds and the use of facilities. So, again, because of our size, it's a matter of very unlimited access and as I need to speak with vice-president of administration or any one of the accountants in the business office or whatever, they are just a phone call away and virtually anytime, so I can speak directly with them, and do quite often, or just memos going to and from their office to mine. And again that would be on an as needed basis. They let me know how much money I have to spend. We already know because of policies that are set and in place what kind of things those budgeted monies will cover. I know that I have to do a p.o., a purchase order, for all funds. And so, it's just via normal business procedures at that point. That would probably be the most formal relationship that I would have with any of the other
units in the institution. Everything else would be a little less formal and would either involve impromptu meetings or memos from our office to their office, whomever that may be.

I can honestly say that our institutions has smooth and trouble-free relations between all of the various units. I think that one thing that contributes to this is the fact that we are small and we see one another often enough and on an as needed basis, so that communication is fairly good. In addition to that, I'm sure it's because we are all committed to operating on the basis of Christian principles, even at our interpersonal relationships here at the institution.

My unit doesn't have very many [contacts with external groups] at all because student affairs office is primarily just concerned about the needs of the student body, and so, my unit would have very few contacts. If it does, it would be going as a representative of the school because of my position as director of student affairs for whatever we may be invited to go for.

This is the first time I've ever had the position of director of student affairs, and certainly didn't come to it because I'm trained for it. And so, to be quite honest, I'm really totally unaware, I shouldn’t say totally, I’m for the most part unaware of these sorts of issues with regard to the kinds of work I am doing. My focus thus far has almost been exclusively on the internal needs and therefore I
really must plead ignorance at that point.

I don’t know that we will [compete in other markets outside of our organization now or] in the near future. [The kinds of things our unit needs to know about what is going on outside the organization] I would think the one thing would be legal matters. We, of course, live in a very litigious age and society, and the kinds of things that I deal with are of course very much subject to litigation. And so, I know that there are, for example, certain publications nowadays directed specifically at student affairs and deans of student affairs units and legal matters concerning those sorts of responsibilities. As of right now, we do not have any way other than past experience, perhaps, of administrators here at the school to find out about these things. However, I am currently requesting from the, from some of the other administrators, our vice-presidents, their input as to how we can improve our awareness of these sorts of things in my unit.

Information, exclusively [are the main kinds of resources we need from outside groups]. At this time I’m not dependent on any [outside groups] of them, but I am pursuing the possibility of that. We need to be more aware of what’s going on in these sorts of responsibilities and units outside our institution, but we are right now just beginning to investigate some of these
The only problem we have right now is the financial. There is a financial obligation to interact and be a part of external groups and organizations and utilize their resources and such as that and as of right now I haven't kept up with them.

I would be the head of the unit, and under me, or under the purview of my office, you might say, there would be the faculty representative to the student council, and he would report to myself. And then there would be the director of what we call the encounter missions, which is also under the purview of my office. This is primarily a way to help students find a local or community or church based activities in which they can be involved. Sort of a, almost a placement type service, although that would not be an adequate description of it. And he would report to myself. And then I would be responsible for, as noted earlier, everything else under the purview of this office, and I would report directly to the vice-president of academic affairs, and to the president of the institution.

[The main rules or procedures we follow] since we're such a small unit, it would just be the job description of myself, the job description of the director of encounter missions and the job description of the faculty representative. Each one would have a job description with expectations, goals and agendas and that sort of thing, and
then we get considerable freedom and considerable latitude for each one to work out those expectations as they themselves think would be best in any given situation. And I think that works quite well, especially in a small institution in which we encourage a relational aspects for student life as much as we do academic aspects of a student’s experience here.

The students, since we are a one-hundred percent a commuter school, totally non-residential school, we have only one requirement of anything like that and that would be that we require each student to have, each student is taking nine semester hours or more, we require them to be covered by with some type of health insurance. If they are strictly a part-time student, that requirement is waived. Other than that, we don’t have any, we don’t have campus nurse or health facility or anything like that, again because we’re totally a commuter school. Those students are only here for three or four hours and then they’re gone. As far the employees go, it would be very similar in terms of no health facilities on the campus itself. The school does provided health insurance for us and does provide a retirement plan for salaried employees, which I might add both policies I think are quite generous and therefore that is not a problem in terms of retaining competent and highly qualified personnel.

There is encouragement to be members of various sorts
of professional associations, and encouragement to be active, not just passive members, but active members of those associations, whether it means presenting papers or being an officer in the associations or whatever. We are encouraged as well to invite these associations, when needed, to come and hold their meetings on our campus, which of course would sort of motivate us to be a part of them. We publish a professional journal ourself, and so we are encouraged to contribute to that, which means continued interaction with both other disciplines as well as other people in our discipline. We, all full-time faculty members, are given the opportunity for a sabbatical to further their study and their education in one way or another, or something along those lines. So I think all of these things, oh, and there are encouragements to attend professional conferences even if we’re not members of that particular organization.

There are various student associations, for example, the International Student’s Association, the Student Missionary Fellowship, the Bi-vocational Ministers Fellowship, and there would be several others. Do you want me to list them all? (No) So, there would be several informal associations and fellowships like that. The only thing like that for work would be, we encourage and try to have a couple of informal faculty and spouse get-togethers a year, a Thanksgiving get-together, a Christmas
get-together, and again because we are a small institution, we can actually get the whole school, faculty, staff and administrators, all together at the same time.

I think [informal groups] keeps the morale up to know that the relationships we have extend beyond the sometimes frantic and stressful 10 hours or 8 hours we put in here at the school. I think it is a very, and I believe in a sense everyone confirms this, is a very positive thing for the relationships during the time that we are here. To know that one family is concerned with another family on the level of family and not just professional colleague makes one's relationship on the professional level more positive. So, yeah, I think that makes a big difference.

I feel very much a part of [these groups] it, both because of my interaction personally as well as my wife's interaction with others. And, I think that whether it be my ideas or my wife's ideas and whether they are quite novel or not they would be well received and taken on the merit of how appropriate they would be for this particular group at this time.

[My supervisor] would be the vice-president for academic affairs. [I work] very closely [with him]. We talk virtually every day about substantive issues and then we meet formally in one way or another every week.

[To work with him] is very stimulating for myself, because I think he himself sets a good example of high
expectations and yet freedom to fulfill those expectations in the way that my strengths and my abilities and my experiences would lead me to think were the best ways. And he's concerned and it's obvious he is concerned on a more personal level as much as he is on a professional level, so it is a very good experience to work with him.

[Working with the others in this unit is also] very good, because I think for the same reasons we are all concerned on a very personal level as much as if not more so on a professional level for one another and that makes a very good experience.

Through a couple of different avenues [people find out what is going on]. One is my unit, which I head up of course, is integral to many things in the organization and therefore for something to be happening I usually have to be aware of it, and I find out through the formal meetings as well as the informal meetings. And also just because in an institution this small it's hard for something to be happening without everyone knowing about it.

One thing that our overall administrative philosophy does is encourage consensus building, and I honestly think none of our current administrators would have a philosophy or a method which causes them to make decisions totally apart from what others think. We encourage very strongly interaction cross disciplinary and from unit to unit. So, I usually bring things before the academic cabinet and get
their feedback, and modify and revise as needed, but usually just build a consensus within that academic cabinet. I think I have tremendous say about anything affecting my work, and my opinion I honestly think is valued very highly. Anytime a decision is being made which affects anything inside my unit, and often times outside my unit, I am consulted about it with all the details. I have yet in the time I've been in this position, which hasn't been long, I have yet to see or hear of anything done which involved me in any way at all on which I was not consulted, and if I disagreed, but the decision was made in a way different from what I thought, it was openly discussed, that I was given reasons why the decisions were made in a different direction.

[I have been director of student affairs for] one year, well, not even a year, for this academic year, so about five months in this position. [Previously, I was] Professor of New Testament only.

The president of the student council [informally is the most influential person]. He would [be the most] influential because of the importance of his position and his role, and because of the respect I think he has throughout the institution, both in terms of employees of the institution as well as students of the institution. Beyond that, I guess myself and the faculty representative to the student council. That's about all of us, actually.
I don’t think you could say any one person for sure [controls this institution]. I think that, of course, the president sets the tone, but by no means does he control in the sense that nothing is done apart from his agreement to it. So it would be a broad spectrum of those who are in administrative positions, from the president through the vice-presidents to the other members of the academic cabinet.

[To get ahead] I think simply do the job that you are charged with. In other words, carry out your responsibilities faithfully, and demonstrate some vision and concern for things that may not be inherently a part of your responsibilities if simply wanted to fulfill the letter of the law.

I think that there are financial rewards in that as you are evaluated you are rewarded financially, and other avenues for professional enhancement, I guess I would say, in other words, those who would like to travel to a conference and present a paper or whatever. I would think those who have excelled around here would perhaps be given a little more opportunity for that sort of thing, and if one wished to gain access to other opportunities of influence he would be enabled to do that as they fulfilled the responsibilities that their charged with initially.

Yes, praise. I meant to say that at the beginning and then I forgot. Because we are a small institution and we do
depend a lot on personal communication among the constituents of the institution and we do value the place of commending a job well-done, I think personal praise, yes, is a way of rewarding.

I think we usually work [problems] through until one side or the other is willing to defer to a consensus. We try and eliminate any sort of power struggle by virtue of working toward a consensus in all decision-making processes.

[I am] very satisfied [working here]. I think the opportunity to shape and mold the direction of the institution and not exclusively, of course, I do that in concert with others, not myself. But at least I have an input and that input is taken seriously. And then the opportunity to pursue fulfilling those goals and those directions and motivations in the way I think most appropriate. I guess to sum all that up the opportunity to do and be what I think ought to be done and who I think I am.

I guess at this point [what I am least satisfied with] would probably be the financial strictures. The overall purpose and mission is exclusively for the training of Christian ministers. That is of course broadened or maybe we should say sub-divided because there are various kinds of ministries. But, nonetheless, there are a core of concerns which we try to keep in the center of everything we are about. [We pursue our mission] by seeking to offer to the
student what we see as the irreducible minimum for, I'm talking here about our curriculum of course, those things which we see as necessary for effective and relevant ministries, whether it be a counseling ministry supporting a local church, whether it be a pastoral ministry or whether it be a mission effort or whatever the case may be, those things that we see as irreducible for effective and relevant ministries, offer that through the curriculum, and then supplement that with what we see as essential aspects of training that are not part of the curriculum, such as emphasizing the relational aspects between faculty and the students, involving the student's whole family in their training, trying to provide things for the students' wives, not just for the students themselves. And hopefully bringing the students to the point where they can integrate these non-curricular essentials with the curricular essentials.

I would say [we are] one of the best kept secrets around, because it is an opportunity to work with people who are far more competent than most would ever envision, and it is pleasant because the personal relationships are for the most part, and almost exclusively, void of the types of power struggles and personal competitions and such as that that we so often find in professional workplaces.

I think quality is [most emphasized] and that is, of
course, has to be taken into consideration in light of what our purpose and our mission is. I definitely think quality would be far above the others.

I don't think I have any hesitation at all in [taking risks or sticking my neck out]. I guess [our greatest success] would be the recapturing of student confidence after having just gone through a very controversial and rather disruptive time in the life of the institution, that time was immediately before I took this office, or this responsibility. And student confidence, well I think the best way to put it is that student confidence in the administration of the school was rather low and student certainty about the direction of the school was rather low. I think the ability to recapture their confidence and communicate to them what direction the school was going could be considered a success, by no means would I claim that our office only is responsible for that. It came very much because of working in concert with all the other units of the school, but very much centered on this office because of what this office is charged to do in terms of relationship between the students and the administrative and teaching end of the schools. We are the that link in that bridge.

I guess at this point I would have to say [the greatest failure]
would be the, probably letting the financial planning of the recent student banquet get out of hand. And the reason it was a failure, we didn't go over budget at the end of the day so it wasn't a failure in that sense, but it was a failure in the sense that I did not oversee the student council closely enough during the planning of that to make sure they communicated with my office and the business office as much as necessary so the budget wasn't misused. They weren't experienced in working with budgets and I didn't oversee them closely enough and therefore they did not even think about the kinds of obligations they had to turn in proposed costs and that sort of thing. So it would have been a matter of overseeing inexperienced students more closely at the point of budgetary planning.

I think [the unit is operating effectively] because, again I do, and by effective I mean the students have no hesitation as far as I can tell and from the feedback I get from student council that discussing any concern, matter or problem or hope or anything with my office, no hesitation at all. And I would think that would be one of the first and foremost measures of success for my office.

I think that in the past the unit was looked at as just a paper-shuffling unit without really making any substantive contribution to the life of the student. And,
that is one change that has been made, both in the job
description as well as in the unstated goals, in that the
first and foremost objective is to let the students know
they do have a voice, an avenue of recourse. They do have
an administrator whose first and foremost reason for being
there is to give an ear to their concerns and such as that.
And communicating that to them has been the way to make that
change and I think so far has been effective.

[The organization has changed] it too has become more
student oriented. In the past, many of its objectives and
concerns were directed more at the larger academic world or
the larger church world, you might say, where as I think now
the institution as a whole has become more student oriented
and I think the students sense that and appreciate that.

I think the main challenge will probably be creativity
and innovation. It will be very easy to slip into ruts, to
do things the way they have always been done, and yet if
there is anything that changes from one microgeneration to
the next microgeneration, it is students. And I think the
way to handle it, or one way we can perhaps meet that
challenge, is probably going to be to continue giving the
students as much freedom as we can in determining the things
that perhaps would be best, most appropriate to them, at
this point. Obviously, that does not mean curricular
decisions. They are not at the point where they can make
that sort of input and contribution to the school. But in
terms of student activities, in terms of the kinds of things that help them with the problems they face oftentimes they can shed a lot more light on that than we as administrators can. The willingness to allow the students to sort of set the pace and objectives for student life. To set some of those objectives and agendas themselves. And the willingness to yield to their own personal thoughts and desires at that point.

I think [one strength] is student orientation would certainly be one of them. I think that beyond that, I would know two of them. One, professional competency. Again, we have an extremely high percentage, speaking of academic competency, extremely high percentage of Ph.D’s for the faculty, earned university Ph.D’s, and as well as ministerial experience. So, the competency of the faculty would be one thing. And then beyond that, a real commitment throughout the organization to the principles which we espouse. Not just, I don’t think, window dressing, but a real commitment throughout the organization to make what we say also what we do and I would [also add] time and finances.

Probably finances [is the main problem we face]. We have many serious needs, right now, to make the school what it ought to be, and it’s going to take a substantial amount of money to begin to address those needs.
I guess in terms of change in this unit, I would probably point out the need to have someone else help me. In other words personnel assistance, in one way or another. I think the same thing, [that needs change in the entire organization is additional] personnel. We probably are just stretched too thin to accomplish the things that we need to accomplish with the utmost of comprehensiveness.
I was born in Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Dutch country, in Campbell town, Pennsylvania which is about five miles or so east of Hershey. My parents moved to Michigan when I was young, so most of my years I spent growing up in Michigan. Graduated from high school in Marshall, Michigan and went to the Moody Bible Institute right out of high school and graduated from the Moody Bible Institute with a diploma. Went on to Michigan State to complete my Bachelor’s degree and earned an education degree in the process. My graduate work was at Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburg and I suspect that I have take some additional course work at eight or ten different colleges and different places in the country that I have lived in.

My job is Director of the LeTourneau Education for Adult Professionals program, we refer to as the "leap program" in the Metroplex. We have a site in north Dallas and a site over in Bedford where we are giving thought to some additional sites in the Dallas area. I report to the main campus of LeTourneau University or in Longview that is headed up by the Dean of Graduate and External Studies. I have been with LeTourneau for the short period of three months.
The purpose of the Metroplex program of LeTourneau University is to provide nontraditional degree programs and we offer a Bachelor degree in Business Management which is completion of an undergraduate degree. In order to get into it, you have to have already earned sixty credit hours of appropriate undergraduate education. So it is possible for students to complete their third and fourth years of their Bachelor's degree by going school one night a week from 6-10 p.m. over an eighteen month period. So you can complete your degree, the last two years of your degree, in eighteen months in school one night a week. We are beginning a Master's degree in Business Management program. We will be enrolling our first class November 9th. In January, will begin our first Masters degree in Engineering Management program. We are tied directly towards the main campus in Longview and every thing we do here conforms with what we call the mission fit of the University, conforms with all of the policies of the University, and we simply are an extension of the main campus here in the Metroplex. So I work with the dean of the Graduate and External Studies at Longview and the other administrative officers in Longview. Here in the Metroplex our staff is extensively involved with the media because of advertising and recruiting. We work with Chamber of Commerce, Christians Businessmen's Association, a number of minor clinics, and when I cite this different organizations we work extensively with older
preachers. When I'm citing these different groups and organizations a major reason for this is to assist us with recruiting of adjunct faculty. We work entirely with as many external groups as possible. Because the LeTourneau University is distinctly evangelical and Christian, about 80% or so of the adjunct faculty applicants do not go anywhere because of a mission fit. Their background alongside the philosophical position of LeTourneau makes recruiting an exacting process and in some ways a difficult process.

I am a person who views problems as challenges and opportunities. The challenges and opportunities are primarily in the area of improving quality. We have a tremendous faculty effort. The process I have mentioned are just a little to relieve in recruiting faculty. We end up with superb faculty. Our challenges are working with the faculty to become ever better faculty members because most of them come to us without previous teaching experience. We make a very conservative effort to recruit from the marketplace, from the corporate world, from men and women who are in business for themselves or whatever. Because our students are in their late 20's, 30's, 40's, 50's in order to get into our program they have to have a minimum of four years work experience. We want to place faculty in front of our students who are state of the art in what they do. We can find that from the corporate world and help them be good
and really retrain their teaching skills. So challenges are significantly in the areas of improving quality, expanding our facility, looking for an employment replacement because an employee left in our student services area, a critical link in addressing our student's needs. So challenges are primarily in the area of improving quality.

I am an advocate of not working with rumor. I detest rumor. Because we do not operate that way, we have very little of that occurring because the staff know that it isn't going to be significantly redundant and they know that is doesn't do them any good, from a personal standpoint. Because it is the kind of university that it is, there is significantly less of that kind of thing than in state supported universities that I have previously worked. I deal directly with people involved that we think that we have initiative to visit with a faculty member about who we have some concerns quality wise. I believe in immediate action. I believe in visiting with the individual involved and if it is certain individuals, sitting down with the appropriate people and discussing and deciding, not discussing and who's fault is it.

Variations and unexpected situations [that occur in our work] depends on when things come along in the student's lives because our students for the most part are in full time and part time jobs. These are the kinds that affect
our ability to sit in class and get a job such as a death of a spouse. Most unexpected things come along when our student services aren't available.

[Some barriers here are] because of putting on those strings rapidly, and your never appreciated, staff will not stay. Insufficient [numbers of] staff is not great.

I'm responsible for [the coordination of the staff]. [Goals and objectives are spelled out] very specific goals in terms of the number of students that we are recruiting. Very specific goals for our marketing effort. Specific goals as far as classroom occupancy, the types of things that classrooms may be used for. We do have very good, excellent measurable goals.

We have a lot of direct feedback from our students. Every time a student completes a five week course, they complete an evaluation form on the textbooks, curriculum, the facility, the instructor, and that along with the visits to the students, which I enjoy as much as possible because I come to some of the night classes. That is how we know when we are doing a good or bad job.

Units inside of our institution include the financial aid office and the personnel office, it also includes the library in a major way. It is with the academic chairs of the different disciplines. Externally, it the company we lease space from, it is different city and
political organizations that assist us in recruiting faculty. Again, that includes churches in a significant way.

If it is internal, our lead area, for instance, student services, is very great to relate with the student services office on the main campus. My only interest is in not only in being surprised, but everyone reports to me is very free to work with the unit over the main campus. We do that as much as we can. Externally, the head of the market unit has total free to communicate with the radio stations, our TV stations, newspapers, and a couple of billboards around the freeways. We have total freedom to pursue that. I am the lead person for contacts with the city groups and all churches.

Internally, the library - we are heavily dependent on them for support criticism. The program is set... The budget, however, is controlled underneath the president and the allocation is made there. The personnel office does the payroll and orientation on healthcare options. Externally, we are dependent on all of the different forms of media for marketing effort and for our marketing students and advertising for faculty. We are dependent very much on churches. Our condition of employment requires that each staff person is not only a member of church, but also actively involved in that church. We are dependent on a large number of the churches as a major contact for new
faculty. Evangelical churches are described as institutions that believe that the Bible is the inspired word of God and that it is the soul guide for faith and practice.

Evangelical Christians are characterized by adherence to difficult principles and demonstrating a social contrast. Not working in Christian faith. The differentiation between a fundamentalist, a liberal, and an Evangelical is that an Evangelical is more into a social conscience. The other end of the theological continuum would be the liberal who are short on Biblical content and fact often do not even consider the Bible to be an inspired book; it is just a good book. They would be sometimes be characterized as being long on social concern and short on theological foundation.

[Our relationship with others] externally, when you are spending money on all sorts of ads your relationship goes very smoothly because the newspaper and radio station is saying that they enjoy receiving the money. So that works very smoothly. Our relationships with the churches is very smooth because we are not in competition with any program the church. As far as city relations, their relationship is smooth because our university is a value to them and most of the community. It brings a lot of clean dollars into the community. Internally, it is partly because again us being Evangelical Christian university impose all of our mission trip from the stand point of what the university is all
about. So we have a common focus and common goal which help
the worker relationship to be smooth. We have power
stresses and strains and if we didn’t catch the stresses and
strains, we would not be a creative and dynamic
organization. Most of our stresses and strains are caused
by efforts to improve quality, and our constructed nature
that destructive.

[Our outside contacts are] with the civic
organizations and service clubs - some of the professional
associations like the Christian’s Ministry Management
Association, CMMA. So I would add those two to the
earlier list of Chamber of Commerce, churches and media.

In the area of academic program and our pre-academic
program business, management at the undergraduate level and
business administration at the graduate level and
engineering management is at the graduate level. Those are
the fields and our two graduate programs are new to us-we
are just beginning those. Some of the associations with the
engineers aren’t as extensive as they will be very soon in
the future.

Part of working in a metropolitan environment is the
opportunity to help the network of peers who do similar
things in other institutions. We rely extensively on
networking and information sharing and idea sharing. That
is important to us. We make a conscious effort to get our
people out for conferences and workshops and make an effort
to help our people pay attention to the literature in their field, especially professional journals.

[Our main resource is] mostly information from the peer settings, network team activities, and from professional associations. In every instance, we receive assistance in process of recruiting students because no matter where we are at when they here about the program if they know of anybody who has an interest in an additional degree of this particular type of program will receive referrals of students. A lot of our networking occurs through Evangelical churches because we are active in different Evangelical churches. That again is just a prime source for students and faculty.

[The outside groups we are] most dependent on [would be] the media, churches for support in terms of faculty, and some prospective students and networking standpoint. The different media and churches would be most dependent on.

Having worked with federal agencies in the past as part of my work experience and state supported colleges and universities, the negative difficulties are very few. The positive difficulties are primarily concerned with growth and quality and we do not get tired of addressing those. One example, I mentioned, at the end of each course there is an evaluation process and we are in the process of redesigning that in order to more specifically to get at more of the kinds of information we need. But that we are
doing as a positive step than as a reaction to something that is negative. It is a good form and process now, but we can make it better. That is the kind of challenge that much of our time goes towards addressing.

The university is Evangelical Christian, administered by a board of directors. The board appoints the president, the president is the chief executive officer. Reporting to the president are members of the cabinet which include the vice-president for academics, vice-president for business affairs, vice-president for student services, the manager of the physical plant and grounds, the vice-president for university development, and the Dean of Graduate and External Studies. That is administration on the main campus in Longview. I am the lead person for the non-traditional degree-granted program in the metroplex. Reporting to me are the unit heads that I mentioned earlier in the areas of facilities, marketing, student services, and my ministry assistant.

Because we are small we have a lot more direct communication than like the university where I used to work. Again, I refer to Evangelical Christian approach which in itself carries more confidence and trust and more singular focus and commitment. We do have faculty book and student book. We have do have a staff manual. They are there and the essentials in orderly management are included there.
The times we have to cite a verse in one of those manuals is quite uncommon.

We have a very good health care program and retirement plan. We have long-term disability insurance, visual and dental care which is available on an optional basis. A lot of logistical needs like ours are taken care of kind of automatically because of living and working as a community of believers when someone is in need and someone else knows it, they are right there to help. We have the normal fringe benefit and a lot of benefits that are intangible because of the kind of institution we are. Our faculty, staff and dependents are able to have either tuition waived or partially remitted and there is a real effort to encourage everyone to involved in the formal education process and many of our employees take advantage of that opportunity. Additionally, more so here than the other larger institutions that I have been in the light. There is more encouragement to participate in the workshops, more of an effort to brings workshops on campus to help with continuing education needs.

We have a couple [of groups] that are formal on the main campus. There is an association that is faculty who get together to primarily focus on quality and advice to the president and other administrative offices on starting new programs where the president would ask the advice of the faculty group. Informal groups-the natural care and concern
is primary focus; the internal support is really the major thing. We will routinely recognize birthdays with a social type of thing such as a restaurant or something. We have a coffee area and our staff routinely will routinely go there.

The staff looks forward to going to the break area and visiting with friends there. We don't have any segment of the staff avoiding the copy room because of not wanting to talk to someone else.

We have weekly staff meetings where we have a devotional period where we focus our thoughts on the Bible and a prayer time. Because we are no larger than we are, the informality exists because everyone has a good idea on what everyone else is doing and will routinely pitch in, even if we are not filling a vacancy and addressing the work load that that causes. Every year you will have some busy times and some slow times and there isn't the reluctance to move in and help someone else who is pressured at that time. It doesn't make a difference if it is in the job description or not. In the small informal workplace, if somebody needs the help they just do it.

There is celebration over successes [here]. Sometimes the most creative ideas are met with the least reception at the time because it takes a while for the idea to be understood. The environment is conducive to the original thinking and presentation of ideas, again, because of size and our focus. If a person works particularly hard and
achieves success that is rejoiced on part of the others. Sometimes we have to encourage people to work a little less hard and go home rather than spend so many hours at work. Because we are a firm believer in the family and because of the degree of commitment people, we have to remind them to keep their response in balance.

My supervisor is Dean of Graduate and External Studies on the main campus in Longview, Dr. LaVerne Ludden. [I work] very closely [with him] partially because I have only been with LeTourneau University for three months and wanting no separation of LeTourneau’s on-campus programs and off-campus programs. We can contribute to the health and vitality of the main campus and the main campus definitely contributes to our health and vitality. My schedule is to be in Longview one day a week for at least half a day involved in meetings of all the directors that report to that dean, make contacts around campus as necessary. [Dr. Ludden] is a man of great background and experience in field of adult and continuing education. So it to me is stimulating to me to work with someone of that background. He is a very quick thinker, decisive, and he considers positions and makes up his mind—we don’t have issues that drag and take months.

For me it is a thrill to work with the [others in my unit]. We are growing. As we do add additional staff, one of my concerns is that we lose our degree of family. But I
am really privileged to be working with these people at this point.

[How we find out what is going on is normally through] our weekly staff meetings [which] are primarily informational, [the] student newspaper on the main campus, and we get copies of this publication and put them out for our students.

[Decisions are made] as close to the point or impact as possible. The heads of our three units know that they have a lot of latitude to do their jobs and we give them this because they are very confident and if there is a question about the appropriate decision or several different decisions to be made, they are discussed with me. But inside the parameters of a position, the unit heads are free to make decisions and I encourage that. We don’t have time to do each other’s work. It is more informal than formal.

I have a weekly meeting of the staff here in the metroplex. We meet almost every week in Longview and that is my purpose of going to Longview every week. My counter parts and I meet with the dean and any issue of any substance is on the agenda and a lot of them become routine informational items. If we have concerns or suggestions, we a certainly free to make them. Because the university doesn’t procrastinate in making decisions there are those times when you think a little more information might have had an effect on the decision. But I would rather work like
we are working than to drag things out and do things two or three times before a decision is made.

[The really influential people here are] the dean, the vice-president, the director of the internal affairs, and the president. All three are absolutely aware of what is going on in the program. The president [controls what goes on in the organization as a whole].

Our definition of getting ahead is a little different. We consider ourselves getting ahead if we see quality improving and if we see our programs affecting the lives of our students. Most people would not be at LeTourneau if they were there for the level of compensation because a lot of us have worked other places where we were earning more money than at LeTourneau, and the LeTourneau salaries are respectable-I'm not saying that the money is not the reward for everyone being at LeTourneau. So opportunities for getting ahead are there. A lot is focused on the involvement with improvement with quality and impacting the lives of our students.

We have a lot of verbal expressions of appreciation and for a Christian the real reward is connected by human expression of thanks anyway. Human expressions of thanks always appreciative. We are really a ministry anyway and we serve Jesus Christ. Our reward comes from doing a good job.

I make an effort to understand the issue[s] and will address it directly with the person or persons involved.
Sometimes the situation is addressed by visiting with only one person. Sometimes if it is only a difference of opinion, I will need to get two or more persons together. Differences are handled differently and directly and handled without any lose of appreciation of the people. Most of our differences relate or are caused by the rapid growth of the program and common interest in deciding how to do a job better. But those are easy differences to address rather than simply because a person doesn’t like another person or a person is jealous because of another person’s stature or something like that.

[How satisfied I am working here] is a question I could answer better in a year from now because I am so new. But I made a very conscious decision to come to LeTourneau, and if I had the same decision to make again, I would certainly keep it the same. I really appreciate the insistence of LeTourneau University on the mission fit on the part of every single employee whether the person knows the lines or is a family member standing in front of the class is part of a mission fit for everybody, which addresses a lot of issues front end. It gets irritating to me to be on the campus of a Christian university, but not Christian practice. Some schools used to be very Christian in practice and lost their theological distinctives and are less in Christian practice even than are number of colleges and universities. If I had to do it all over again, I would certainly chose LeTourneau.
It is an exciting program and it is one that is a real Christian ministry along with a solid academic program.

The ministry aspect of what we do [makes me feel the most satisfied] seeing lives changed, seeing non-Christian students accept Christ and become Christians. That doesn’t happen every day, but it happens. A lot of our non-Christian students go away of thinking thoughts that they thought they would never think of in regard of some of the central issues of life and death and impact on how they conduct themselves on an ethical stand point. For our Christian students, it certainly is a time of spiritual growth as well as academic growth.

We have attractive facilities and we are making them more attractive, but I sometimes wish that we could do a little more on the stand point of the studies.

The overall purpose [here] is to serve Jesus Christ and we do that by offering academic programs and quality spiritual instruction. [We] pursue [our mission] by the vigorous screening process front end so that only employees, people of like faith and that doesn’t mean one denomination, a lot of people come from many denominations to LeTourneau because there is no one denomination that has all of the believers in it. For example, we have some Presbetarians on our faculty and staff and as long as they are Evangelical in their theology, they are as welcome as any other denomination.
[We have a] real simple community, since we focus on something that is very important that directly affects the lives of the people. [We emphasis] quality and it is effected by speed and all of the other things. What is most emphasized is the personal spiritual life, which is the framework. When the personal spiritual life is in order so many other things fall into place. [I feel comfortable in taking risks here] because of this being a non-traditional program there are a lot of risks trying to put this program together and get it up and running.

[Our] majors successes would be doubling the enrollment in twelve months. [Failures are for instance are when] once in a while recruiting an adjunct faculty member that doesn’t live up to our expectations and not able to teach well.

[We are] not operating effectively because of having it in an inadequate stand side far so to many functions are performed at a level where it should not be performed. Too much time goes into clerical routines when part of people should be the ideal people. We are ineffective in that. The unit is three years old so it is fairly new. When you are consistenly in a growth mode it is kind of hard to say like you could if you looked over about twenty years or so. Because it is so new, there is a feeling with being a dynamic type of program. We got this way because of very good planning and committment.
The organization as a whole has expanded all the way up and down because those services that we depend upon on the main campus to help us provide, it has caused for additional staff there. This program is the reason for the creation of being a graduate of external studies. It has effected the university ministry organization configuration by adding a new dean and support staff.

Our main challenge is keeping growth under control because this non-traditional approach education is where education is nationally headed. We could dwarf the traditional program at Longview over night. We could consume so many of the resources of the traditional program, but we have to be careful that we don’t slight the traditional program because it is still very valuable for some people right out high school and for people who could not handle a fast pace adult-oriented instruction. Controlling growth is a big challenge. The plan on the part of some people was to open a similar non-traditional program in Houston and because just wanting to make sure the program was thorough and wanting to know how it would fit in with the main campus program, we haven’t gone to Houston yet. We have a tentative date at this point for going to Houston and we will have a team go down there in probably even in the next couple of weeks to at least look at space.

Our major strength is our commitment to Christ and the Biblical prospective under the confidence that we have
that as they fall to Biblical injunctions that we have some supernatural things going for us. Most specifically, what the Evangelical refers to as the leading spirit.

[Our organizational strength as a whole is] that it is focused, [it] doesn’t try to be things to all people. It shares common commitment. We don’t have any main problems. We have challenges. We really don’t have any significant problems and people are amazed when we say that. Problems are trying to handle creative ideas, fitting them in to the overall program, and just trying to take advantage of very good people. They have good efforts to get involved. Again, our problems are really opportunities and challenges. [Our challenge is] accommodating growth, deciding how large we want to become and how quickly we want to become that size, knowing when it is time to hire and bring on new staff.

[We need to] expand facilities which we are doing and will be available to us in January. Adequate space would be one [area in most need of change in our unit]. [In the organization as a whole in most need of change] may be more formality in the planning in the process. It has a degree of formality now, but has some informality.
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